

Copyright

by

Amy M. Schmisser

2005

The Dissertation Committee for Amy M. Schmisser certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

BEYOND THE CLIENT SERVICE INTERACTION:
AN EXAMINATION OF THE EMOTIONAL LABOR OF CHANGE
IMPLEMENTERS

Committee:

Laurie K. Lewis, Supervisor

Craig R. Scott

Anita L.Vangelisti

Dawna Ballard

Katherine I. Miller

BEYOND THE CLIENT SERVICE INTERACTION:
AN EXAMINATION OF THE EMOTIONAL LABOR OF CHANGE
IMPLEMENTERS

by

Amy M. Schmisser, B.S.; M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
the University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2005

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to sincerely thank my advisor, Laurie Lewis, for her unwavering guidance and mentorship throughout my graduate studies. Laurie, I am so fortunate to have worked under you and will never forget your efforts in helping me see this project through to its completion. You have been such an instrument of support both personally and professionally—I am forever grateful and indebted to you.

I would also like to acknowledge my committee members: Craig Scott, Anita Vangelisti, Dawna Ballard, and Kathy Miller for their invaluable insights and commitment to this project. Your questions and perspectives have made me a better scholar and have improved the quality of this research. Thank you all for sharing your expertise and support. Craig, I especially want to thank you for all of your wisdom and direction throughout my doctoral program—I have learned much from you and am a better scholar and teacher because of you.

Additionally, I would like to offer my continued thanks and gratitude to Gail Fairhurst. Gail, as I have told you before, you are a huge reason for where I am today. I will always treasure you as both a friend and mentor in the field. Thank you so much for your advice and support over the years.

To my friends and former colleagues from UT—Cailin, Stacey, Kat, Mary, Brian, Karen, and Geoff. I want to sincerely thank you all for your friendship, collaboration, and inspiration. I miss each and every one of you. I especially want to acknowledge my dear friend and colleague, Stephanie—words cannot express my appreciation for you and all

that you have meant to me over these last six years. I would never have made it through this process without your emails, calls, and visits. God bless you!

Likewise, I want to thank my small, but mighty, cohort, Kanan and Alicia. I am so grateful for the two of you—for your wisdom and encouragement as both friends and colleagues in the discipline. I look forward to many more conventions with you all in the years to come.

I want to convey my sincerest gratitude for my parents, Jerry and Reggie Mattingly. Your love and willingness to always “lend a hand” or kind word when I need it is such a blessing, and I cannot thank you enough for your support. I also thank my parents-in-law, David and Pat Schmisser, for their encouragement over the years and for their “recruiting” efforts during this research.

I would also like to acknowledge my son, Ben (a.k.a. “bubba”), whose infectious smile and love of simple things is a constant reminder of what truly matters in life. I am so proud to be your mama.

I especially want to express my deepest love and admiration for my wonderful husband. Dan, you have sacrificed so much and asked for so little during this journey. I absolutely could not have done this without you. The completion of this work is as much an achievement for you as it is for me. You are my true companion, and I love you.

Finally, and most importantly, I want to acknowledge my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, whose faithfulness and steadfast love never ceases to amaze me. Without Him, I am nothing.

BEYOND THE CLIENT SERVICE INTERACTION:
AN EXAMINATION OF THE EMOTIONAL LABOR OF CHANGE
IMPLEMENTERS

Publication No. _____

Amy M. Schmisseur, Ph.D.
The University of Texas at Austin, 2005

Supervisor: Laurie K. Lewis

The purpose of this study was (a) to examine the different factors that would lead change implementers to perform emotional labor either through surface acting (i.e., faking) or deep acting (i.e., feeling) and (b) to identify the different norms characterizing implementers' emotive behaviors as well as the means by which they are socialized to these norms. Results from this study revealed that managers' degree of self-monitoring and identification with their role significantly predicted deep acting behaviors while the degree to which managers understood and practiced certain emotional norms significantly predicted their inclination to surface act. Of the several sets or categories of variables assessed in this study, communication was the only notable predictor and was significantly predictive of surface acting but not deep acting. Qualitative data from open-ended interviews further revealed five themes depicting the emotive norms to which managers, as change implementers, most commonly adhere, including: emotional restraint, directness/honesty, empathy/compassion, positive/empowering, and detachment. Results also point to myriad sources by which these norms are then communicated and shared among leaders, including: culture/industry, academic and professional training, prior experience, intuition/personal values, and popular press literature. Ultimately, these findings underscore the emotionality of planned organizational change as well as give cause for researchers to examine emotional labor across a variety of industries, professions, and organizational contexts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	ix
Chapter 1: Emotion, Communication and Change	1
The Case for Emotional Labor and Change Implementers	3
Conceptualization of Key Emotional Constructs	7
Contributions of Study	12
Dissertation Overview	18
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature	20
Antecedents of Emotional Labor	24
Individual Factors	25
Contextual Factors	33
Communicative Factors	36
Chapter 3: Method	44
Participants and Procedures	44
Design and Instrumentation	49
Data Analysis	65
Chapter 4: Results	67
Part One	67
Quantitative Analysis	
Deep Acting Model	67
Surface Acting Model	71

Part Two	74
Qualitative Analysis	
Emotive Norms	75
Sources for Acquiring Norms	88
Chapter 5: Discussion	95
Contributions	102
Limitations	110
Future Studies	112
Conclusion	122
Appendix A: Interview Protocol/Questions	123
Appendix B: Retained Items of Relevant Measures	125
References	129
Vita	143

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Factor Loadings for Emotional Labor	54
Initial Factor Analysis	54
Second Factor Analysis	57
Factor Analysis of Acting Types	60
Table 2: Raw Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlation	68
Coefficients	
Table 3: Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses	70
The Impact of Key Predictors on Deep Acting	
Table 4: Summary of Stepwise Regression Analyses	73
The Impact of Key Predictors on Surface Acting	

CHAPTER 1: EMOTION, COMMUNICATION AND CHANGE

There is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct, or more uncertain in its success, than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things.

Niccolo Machiavelli
The Prince (1532)

.....managers must themselves feel the pulse of change on a daily continuous basis.....They should have intense curiosity, observe events, analyze trends, seek the clues of change, and translate those clues into opportunities.

Michael J. Kami

Organizational life is unequivocally emotional, ranging from the joy and satisfaction expressed by members who have exceeded their yearly goals, to the collective fears, tensions and frustrations of a struggling work team. Yet, as Ashforth and Humphrey (1995) argue, an “overrationalized view of organizations, and the consequent attempts to regulate emotion, have made it difficult to recognize the pervasiveness and utility of emotion in organizational life and how qualities of the heart give value and meaning to the qualities of the head” (p. 109). Although, historically, organizations are thought to be rational systems and, thus, void of emotion, researchers are becoming increasingly aware of the ubiquity of emotions in organizations (e.g., Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993, 1995; Conrad & Witte, 1994; Fineman, 2000; Goleman, 1998; Hochschild, 1983; Mann, 1997; Putnam & Mumby, 1993; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987; Tracy & Tracy, 2000; Van Maanen & Kunda, 1989; Waldron, 1994; Waldron & Krone, 1991; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996; Zorn, 2002). Most notably, the publication of Arlie Hochschild’s seminal book, *The Managed Heart*, in the early eighties helped launch emotion work into the forefront of organizational studies by drawing attention to the normative pressures employees face with having to publicly manage displays of emotion that are not genuinely felt or experienced—a phenomenon known as emotional labor.

Research has linked the performance of emotional labor with a number of negative, work-related outcomes, including job dissatisfaction (Abraham, 1998, 1999; Kruml & Geddes, 2000b; Locke, 1976; Pugliesi & Shook, 1997; Rutter & Fielding, 1988), job stress (Kahn, 1981), and burnout (e.g., Kruml & Geddes, 2000a; Maslach, 1982; Miller, Birkholt, Scott & Stage, 1995; Morris & Feldman, 1996; Wharton, 1993), to name a few. Yet, studies also suggest that expressing certain emotions, while suppressing others, can actually lead to more positive outcomes, such as decreased stress (Conrad & Witte, 1994), greater job satisfaction (Schuler & Sypher, 2000), improved health and overall well-being (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Conrad & Witte; Zajonc, 1985). Researchers have attempted to reconcile such mixed findings by taking into account different job and individual related characteristics (e.g., Humphrey, 2000; Morris & Feldman, 1996) including the ways in which members manage their conflicting emotions (Kruml & Geddes, 2000a, 2000b).

However, in keeping with early conceptualizations of emotional labor as primarily a client service phenomenon, much of the extant research in this area has been conducted in the service sector (e.g., sales, bill collectors, flight attendants) and, thus, almost exclusively focuses on interactions between employees and consumers (Waldron, 1994). Research has shown that by shifting our definition of the customer or client, we can connect the performance of emotional labor to a variety of work roles and professions including physicians, teachers, police officers and firefighters (Fineman, 2000; Miller, 2002). Yet, even in these professions, the work is still primarily service-oriented and the “customer” is represented by parties external to the organization. What has yet to be addressed is how emotional labor characterizes interactions that are internal to the

organization. The present study marks one of the few attempts, thus far, to truly go beyond the client service interaction and examine affective events that give rise to emotional labor *within* the organization. In this particular case, that event is planned organizational change.

The Case for Emotion Labor and Change Implementers

Organizations today are constantly undergoing change (Zorn, Christensen, & Cheney, 1999). Competitive pressures triggered by advanced technologies, increased globalization, and a spiraling economy, have more or less forced organizations to proactively seek change if they are going to survive in a turbulent marketplace. Lewis (2000) defines planned organizational change as that which is “brought about through the purposeful efforts of organizational members as opposed to change that is due to environmental or uncontrollable forces” (p. 45).

Whether it involves the restructuring and realignment of new policies, new technologies, best practices, personnel, work roles, or the overall objectives of the organization, planned change is an inherently emotional process in that it is often accompanied by the intense fears, curiosity, anxiety, uncertainty, anticipation, and overall ambivalence of organizational members (Bartunek, 1984; Duck, 2001; Huy, 2002). Paradoxically, research suggests that while emotions can be used to express members’ resistance and dissatisfaction with the change process (Zorn, 2002), they also serve as a means by which leaders energize and motivate others towards achieving specific change goals (Kiefer, 2002; Waldron, 1994).

Indeed, responding to the emotional needs and concerns of employees is necessary if members are to be productive in achieving organizational objectives

(Ashkanasy & Tse, 2000). A burgeoning area of research that speaks to the need for leaders to be more emotionally sensitive and responsive to employees is emotional intelligence. Emotional intelligence deals with the individual's ability to monitor and adapt to other's emotions, to discern between different types of emotional displays, and to use that knowledge in guiding and managing the emotive behaviors of self and others (Salovey & Meyer, 1990). Researchers argue that all leaders need to be adept in reading the emotional climate of the organization in this way (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002; Ashkanasy & Tse). When it comes to implementing change, this seems particularly true.

Change implementation is a communicative process by which formal and informal patterns of interaction are established in carrying out various tasks (Lewis & Seibold, 1998). Critical to this process are mid-level managers who, as leaders of their respective work groups, often act as change implementers by communicating the details of the change plan and ensuring that these ideas are integrated into members' everyday work practices (Lewis, Hamel, & Richardson, 2001). Growing emphasis on total quality management and the insurgence of reengineering initiatives have further put managers at a crossroads between the upper echelons who have created change and the employees who must receive it (Turnbull, 1999). According to Huy (2001), "...middle managers shoulder substantial additional burdens during a period of profound change. Besides the already challenging daily tasks of operations and revenue generation, they provide far more hand-holding, practical problem solving, and support than they usually do" (p. 78). Subsequently, managers who are more aware of others' emotions are better able to facilitate learning and acceptance during the change process (Huy, 2001). Without high levels of emotional competency, managers are less apt to negotiate with others and,

ultimately, build advocacy for change (Bunker, Kram, & Ting, 2002). Moreover, because middle managers are heavily involved in the daily operations of the organization and are structurally closer to frontline employees, they tend to be much more aware of members' emotional reactions to change than senior leaders and, as such, are well positioned to make significant contributions in developing and maintaining employees' momentum for change (Huy, 2001).

To achieve company goals and influence the desired attitudes and behaviors of others, managers must also be aware of their own emotional displays, even if it is at the expense of expressing genuine emotion. Kramer and Hess (2002) found that one of the most frequently relied upon rules for managing emotions was to act professionally by presenting a positive or neutral display while masking genuinely felt, negative emotions. More directly, Zorn (2002) discovered that managers seeking to drive and implement new communication technologies often suppressed their own negative emotions about the change in order to effectively motivate users to adopt the new system. His findings lend further credence to the belief that change implementers are expected to be optimistic agents for change and a proactive force in leading others through a change effort, even when they may not feel like doing so. Although emotional role-playing may simply be inherent to the implementer's job, there is long-term risk that can ultimately blur the boundaries between a manager's sense of self and that of the organization.

Thus, organizational change offers a very practical and meaningful context in which to study emotional labor because, as change agents, managers must be able to recognize and manage multiple emotional agendas simultaneously. Although the organizational and practitioner literature is increasingly focused on how managers can

help others better cope with the emotions of the change process, and while studies on the anxieties, resistance, power struggles and tensions of change certainly imply a certain degree of emotionality, there is little empirical evidence to suggest the strategies managers use to publicly manage their own emotions during change, or what factors, other than personality/disposition, would prompt them to manage their emotions in different ways. Given the potentially negative outcomes associated specifically with emotional labor (e.g., stress, burnout, job dissatisfaction, inauthenticity of self), the high costs and failures rates associated with most implementation efforts today, and the indelible impact that managers can have on such efforts (Ashkanasy & Tse, 2000; Huy, 2001, 2002), understanding what leads implementers to manage their emotional labor in different ways is a necessary body of research for communication and organizational scholars to investigate.

Specifically, this study aims to contribute to the communication literature in at least two distinct ways. First, by examining emotional labor, the very symbolic, strategic, and communicative function of emotion in organizations is privileged (Buck, 1984; Waldron, 1994). Emotions are largely performative in that they are often strategically managed and displayed as a means by which to achieve goals and objectives (Goffman, 1959; Planalp, 1999). According to Tracy (2000), “emotion is a performance tied up with organizational and social norms, culturally specific linguistic labels, and continuous interactions among actors, directors, and audience members” (p. 94). Thus, in the case of emotional labor, communication becomes the vehicle through which emotions are managed, controlled, and ultimately “performed.”

Second, while this study seeks to expand our understanding of emotional labor as a communicatively-based phenomenon, its context also serves to underscore the inherent emotionality underlying change processes and the need for more organizational communication change research to investigate the kind of emotive communication required in managing and directing change efforts. The success of a change effort is most often contingent upon human interaction and the ability of implementers to convey emotions in such a way that will lead others to accept and feel positive about the change (Zorn, 2002). Consequently, the communication of emotion, and particularly emotional labor, is critical to the role of the change implementer.

Change implementers rely on certain “display rules” if they are going to help direct members’ emotions and interpretations about the change, regardless of whether they feel up to the task. A communication-based perspective can provide researchers and practitioners alike with a greater sense for what these “rules” are and how they are shared and enacted during the implementation process. Moreover, because managing emotions is so seemingly tied to the implementer’s role and, ultimately, to the success of the change effort, understanding the different factors that potentially influence how emotions are managed and communicated should be of significant import for practitioners, particularly with respect to how managers are trained for their role as implementers.

Conceptualization of Key Emotional Constructs

Many of the emotions expressed in organizations are circumscribed by the cultural norms of a particular organization and/or an individual’s work role (Fineman, 1999). Subsequently, these norms often translate into a set of “display rules” to which individuals adhere in order to be effective in their jobs. However, what is prescribed as

“appropriate” emotional behavior by either the organization and/or work role may not be what is genuinely felt, in which case individuals must work to align their true feelings with those that are expected or required. This type of emotion work and the normative pressures that require members to publicly display and/or suppress certain emotions is known as emotional labor.

Early conceptualizations of emotional labor developed out of Goffman’s (1959), dramaturgical perspective which argues that individuals are like characters in a play, performing on stage for a variety of audiences. For Goffman, emotional expression is about performance. To act on one’s emotions is a presentation of self that comes not from within but from cues taken from the environment. Hochschild (1983) added to this theory the notion of “emotion work.” Emotion work deals with the day-to-day management of emotions stimulated not just by contextual interpretations of what is appropriate behavior but also by individuals’ interactions with one another. Emotion work generally refers to any attempt to manage or alter one’s genuine emotion, while emotional labor is considered here to be a specific type of emotion work that is performed as a required aspect of one’s job or organization.

To labor emotionally typically involves the cultural and normative pressures to coordinate mind and affect, especially when these two dimensions seemingly contradict one another. The sales professional who is *expected* to remain friendly and courteous at all times, the bill collector who *must* be confronting and aggressive with certain clients, or the medical professional who is *trained* to suppress such feelings when a patient has died, are just a few of the many different roles requiring extensive emotional labor.

However, researchers argue that while emotional labor must hold some value for the organization, not all experiences of emotional labor are externally driven (e.g., Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). Tolich (1993) identified another category of emotional labor known as *autonomous emotional labor* in which members individually and spontaneously manage their emotions while performing various job duties. “In autonomous emotional labor, the employee manages emotions to conform to her own standards not only because she feels it is right, but also because she chooses to” (Callahan & McCollum, 2002, p. 224). Similarly, Putnam and Mumby (1993) offered the concept of *work feelings* that describe emotions on the job as a product of discursive action rather than an organizationally sanctioned behavior.

Still, other researchers more narrowly define emotional labor as simply the act of displaying the appropriate emotion, emphasizing that it is the behavior of workers (i.e., their *displays* of emotions), and not their internal feelings, that has an impact on others (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). By focusing on members’ displays of emotion, communication (and not cognition) becomes a more prominent vehicle for managing emotions. Two ways in which individuals manage and ultimately perform emotional labor are through *surface acting* and *deep acting* (Hochschild, 1983).

Surface acting occurs when individuals conform to display rules by expressing emotions that are not actually felt but that are feigned and manifested in the outward presentation of oneself (e.g., gestures, facial expressions, tone, impression management). Conversely, *deep acting* refers to when individuals attempt to induce and actually internalize the emotions they want to display (Hochschild, 1983). The effort that members put forth in altering their inner feelings to match those required by the role

and/or particular circumstances reflects one dimension of emotional labor that Kruml and Geddes (2000b) identified as *emotive effort*. Members who put forth greater effort to “become” their role are engaged in *active deep acting* (Hochschild). However, there are also occasions in which individuals genuinely feel the emotions that they are required to express and, as such, will manage their emotions through *passive deep acting*. Building on these concepts, Rafaeli and Sutton (1987) concluded that the fit between members’ displayed emotions and their authentic feelings can lead to one of several possible emotive states: *emotional dissonance*, *emotional deviance*, and *emotional harmony*.

Like emotive effort, emotional dissonance is considered to be a dimension of emotional labor typically brought on through surface acting, in which the emotions prescribed by a particular role and/or organization are perceived to be in direct conflict with an individual’s true, authentic feelings (Abraham, 1998; Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964; Middleton, 1989; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). The degree to which this type of person-role conflict has an effect on individuals’ well-being is thought to depend on the extent to which they internalize display rules (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). For example, surface actors and deep actors alike may reduce the degree to which they experience the negative effects of emotional labor if they “fake in good faith.” Faking in good faith refers to when individuals conform to the required display rules, but do so with the belief that the display rules are warranted or necessary. For example, teachers may not necessarily feel like being exhorting or positive towards their students on any given day, but if they believe that such expressions of emotion are necessary for being an effective educator, then they are more likely to conform to display rules despite their disparate feelings. Conversely, surface actors and deep actors who conform to display

rules but believe those rules are unnecessary are “faking in bad faith,” which researchers believe may exacerbate the negative effects of dissonance on individuals’ well-being (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). In either case, the discomfort created by the disconnect between genuine and expressed emotions may be enough to compel individuals to align their inner feelings with expressed feelings.

Moreover, some members may choose to deviate from emotional norms altogether. Emotional deviance occurs on those occasions where individuals’ choose not to comply with organizational rules and, instead, express whatever emotions they desire. Although members who deviate from emotional norms may feel more authentic in expressing their emotions, such deviation can result in isolation, demotion, and even termination. In cases where genuine feelings are more aligned with expected emotions, individuals must still exert some degree of emotional labor in order to translate those felt emotions into appropriate emotional displays (Morris & Feldman, 1996), yet they are able to experience greater emotional harmony. When felt emotions are consistent with organizational norms in this way, members feel more authentic and, as such, may be more likely to experience greater well-being (Thoits, 1985).

What leads members to engage in one form or degree of emotional labor versus another is a question that remains largely unexplored within the organizational literature, yet remains a significant one to ask given the potential implications associated with different acting or management types. Because deep actors generally tend to exert more emotive effort to internalize display rules, researchers have argued that they are likely to experience greater levels of stress and burnout, despite the fact that they see themselves as more authentic than surface actors (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). Recent studies,

however, have shown that individuals who surface act tend to experience greater dissonance and, consequently, are more likely to feel stressed and burned out (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995; Morris & Feldman, 1997). Thus, the consequences that were once thought to be universally associated with experiences of emotional labor may very well be contingent upon how emotions are actually managed and performed (Kruml & Geddes, 2000a, 2000b). Understanding the different factors that might influence how individuals manage emotions would not only extend the theoretical landscape of emotional labor but, as predictors, they might also suggest ways in which the organization can minimize the potentially negative impact of managed emotions on members' productivity and well-being.

Contributions of Study

Research has examined a number of factors that potentially influence how one manages emotions, including job autonomy (Abraham, 1998; Morris & Feldman, 1997), negative affectivity (Abraham, 1998), task routineness (Morris & Feldman, 1997), self-monitoring (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1989; Zerbe, 2000), gender (Adelmann, 1989; Morris & Feldman, 1997; Wharton & Erickson, 1993) power of role, explicitness of emotional display norms (Morris & Feldman, 1997) and emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1998). Yet, despite recent attempts to identify these different factors, there are significant gaps of empirical research in this area. Much of the current research lies within the management literature and focuses a great deal on individual and job/task related characteristics (e.g., Humphrey, 2000; Morris & Feldman, 1996). Although these characteristics have been previously associated with the performance of emotional labor, from a theoretical standpoint, it is necessary to continue building a contingency

framework for emotional labor so that scholars gain a better understanding of the relative impact that a number of variables have on the experience of emotional labor (Abraham, 1998). Because emotional labor is defined as the expression/suppression of emotions desired and controlled by the organization, specific emphasis on different contextual and communicative antecedents seems additionally warranted.

Organizations influence how members express emotion as well as the meaning they assign to the emotional expressions of others (Waldron & Krone, 1991). Research has shown that the organizational context ritually establishes expectations for emotional expression through recruitment, training, and socialization processes (e.g., Karabanow, 1999; Miller, 2002; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987; Van Maanen & Kunda, 1987; Waldron & Krone). In fact, Van Maanen and Kunda argue that emotional expressions are so embedded in the culture of an organization that any attempt to manage culture is an attempt to manage emotion. Weiss and Cropanzano (1996) further contend that there are myriad workplace events that give rise to affective states, including roles, job design, organizational settings, and environmental conditions, such as change. Therefore, to not focus on more contextually driven factors would be to ignore a critical dimension of emotion work in organizations, particularly that of emotional labor. Although communication research has certainly acknowledged the importance of the organizational context in managing emotions, it has yet to adequately determine the extent to which certain organizationally controlled factors influence how individuals attempt to manage their emotional labor.

Moreover, scholars have long recognized the role of communication in regulating emotions (e.g., Hochschild, 1983; Planalp, 1999; Sutton & Rafaeli, 1988; Tracy & Tracy,

2000; Van Maanen & Kunda; 1987; Waldron, 1994). The dramaturgical perspective, in particular, has afforded many researchers to take a more communicative approach to understanding emotional labor (e.g., Miller, 2002; Morgan & Krone, 2001; Tracy, 2000). Although many of these studies contribute to theories of emotional labor by providing rich descriptions of emotional labor processes, there is, again, little evidence of any predictive value that communication holds for how others manage their emotions. Researchers need to be able to understand how such variables serve to predict the performance of emotional labor and its associated outcomes so that a collective picture of emotional labor can be drawn. Thus, one contribution of this study will be to extend both our theoretical and conceptual notions of emotional labor by directly measuring its relationship to different individual, organizational, and communicative factors.

On a more practical level, understanding the various organizational and communicative factors that influence the way in which employees manage their emotions could prove to be very beneficial for both individuals and organizations. For members, understanding how certain communication practices give way to different emotional displays can ultimately impact their ability to effectively cope with the demands of the job. For example, if surface acting tends to breed greater dissonance and greater dissonance leads to a detached sense of self and feeling duplicitous, then members might be more inclined to practice deep acting over the long term to avoid these potentially negative ramifications. On the other hand, individuals whose job often demands some degree of detachment to avoid burnout and emotional overload (e.g., health/medical care professionals) might benefit from communication practices that promote surface acting. Similarly, if there are substantial factors within the organization's control that could

impact how employees deal with their emotional labor and its potentially negative as well as positive consequences, and such factors were better understood, then organizations might be more or less compelled to promote these practices as part of their change effort and, therefore, take a more proactive role in helping members manage the change process. Such research could have significant implications for how organizations go about training employees to better cope with their emotions, how organizations attempt to manage culture, the ways in which organizations encourage commitment from employees, the types of interactions that are encouraged within organizations, and how jobs are designed.

Yet another, and perhaps more indirect, contribution of this research is that it offers an alternative context in which to examine and understand emotion work by analyzing the emotional labor of change implementers. As scholars, we cannot ignore the presence of emotional labor and emotive dissonance across a variety of industries and professions (Pugliesi & Shook, 1997). Although managed displays of emotions are obviously critical for business-consumer interactions, the argument here is that they can be as equally pervasive and critical for interactions among managers, subordinates, and peers (Humphrey, 2000).

Emotional labor is such an inherent part of the change implementer's role that more effort should be directed towards examining the ways in which they manage and convey emotions about change. Those responsible for implementing change must be positive in providing guidance and in dealing with the potential resistance of other employees, all while managing their own concerns and frustrations about the change effort. Zorn (2002) contends that the task of implementing new information and

communication technologies, especially, is an inherently ambiguous and emotional process in that there are often no clear-cut guidelines for dealing with emotional labor. As such, implementers must rely on organizationally sanctioned rules as well on their own heuristics in helping others to feel good about the change and in motivating them to achieve change objectives.

However, research has largely ignored the role of emotional labor in managing and implementing change. In lieu of the prevalence of change in organizations today, the critical role that emotional expressions are thought to play in both fueling and hindering change processes (e.g., Kiefer, 2002), and the emotional risks posed to those who must manage change on a daily basis, integrating these two areas of academic research becomes all the more imperative. Doing so would not only extend our traditional notions of emotional labor as a service role phenomenon, but it would help in both shaping and contextualizing the different behaviors associated with emotional labor.

Although this is not a study about how the performance of emotional labor accounts for different change outcomes, it is further poised to contribute to change theory. Researchers have recently begun to devote more attention to understanding how communication influences the change process (Barrett, Thomas, & Hocevar, 1995; Fairhurst, 1993; Fairhurst, Green & Courtright, 1995; Zorn, Page, & Cheney, 2000). Specifically, current work by Lewis and colleagues focuses on the communication used by implementers in conveying change to various constituencies (see Lewis, 1999, 2000; Lewis et al., 2001; Lewis, Richardson & Hamel, 2003; Lewis & Seibold, 1998). One such study reflects on implementers' insights regarding their efforts in communicating change to nonprofit stakeholders. From their data, they developed a predictive model of

communicative strategies that implementers can employ based on their perceived need to be efficient and build consensus around a particular change initiative. Findings from this study could further extend such a model by elaborating on the various emotion management behaviors implementers enact in building solidarity for change.

Additional studies focusing on aspects of implementation examine how perceptions and communication among users facilitate the adaptation of new communication technologies (DeSanctis & Poole, 1994; Fulk, 1993; Leonard-Barton & Sinha, 1993; Poole & DeSanctis, 1990; Rice & Aydin, 1991). Specifically, research has shown that the overall effectiveness of implementing new technologies is largely contingent upon interactions between developers and users (Leonard-Barton & Sinha). As indicated, implementers play a key role in shaping perceptions and attitudes about change and must often manage their emotions in order to make that happen. By analyzing how implementers communicatively manage their emotions in order to garner support for change, future studies could then correlate these strategies with users' perceptions about change to see if such interactions are, indeed, effective in getting others on board with the change.

Finally, the study of emotional labor is still in its very early stages, as is evident in the number of conceptualizations and operationalizations found within the literature. Most of the communication research in this area has been justifiably qualitative, rich in text and focusing primarily on the interactive and constructed nature of emotional labor. However, this study seeks to contribute to the literature by extending and validating existing quantitative measures of emotional labor.

More quantitative assessments of emotional labor are needed in order to compare the relative weight of different factors on various emotional behaviors and outcomes and to provide more powerful statistical evidence for the number of theoretical and empirical discoveries that currently inform emotional labor research. For example, although we know that greater emotional dissonance can lead to increased burnout, we do not know to what extent a direct relationship exists, nor do we adequately understand what leads to greater emotional dissonance in the first place. The predictive value of quantitative assessments can help to fill these empirical gaps and potentially provides some measure of control for individuals and organizations looking to better manage emotions in the workplace.

Dissertation Overview

The purpose of this research is to examine the various individual, organizational and communicative factors that may lead implementers to manage their emotions in different ways as well as to identify the types of rules or norms managers perceive as necessary for successful change implementation. Toward that end, this study will first examine the predictive value of individual, communicative and organizational factors on the performance of emotional labor, including role identity, self-monitoring, empathy (i.e., emotional contagion, empathic concern), efficacy, certainty of display rules, perceived congruency of display rules, perceived “routineness” of change, and perceived consequences of change. A second objective is to assess the emotive norms of change implementers and how they come to learn and inculcate such norms. In other words, are display rules well defined or are they more arbitrarily set?

The following chapters elaborate on these objectives more fully by reviewing the relevant literature pertaining to emotional labor, offering a related set of research questions and hypotheses, and putting forth a study designed to answer those questions. Specifically, Chapter 2 discusses the seminal research pertaining to the major constructs presented here and introduces other key factors that play a role in managing emotional labor. A series of related questions and hypotheses that serve to extend and address the gaps in our understanding of emotional labor are then offered. Chapter 3 provides an overview of the methods that will be used in addressing each of the research questions and hypotheses, including a description of the sampling frame, procedures for collecting data, instruments for measuring key variables, and methods for analyzing data. Chapter 4 then offers the results of the study, giving specific attention to the variables that predict the different acting types associated with the performance of emotional labor as well as offering a description of the emotive norms governing change implementers' efforts. Finally, Chapter 5 provides a discussion of the results by interpreting key findings and suggesting ways in which those findings both confirm and extend the current literature. The chapter concludes with an overview of the study's limitations and contributions as well as the implications it holds for future research in this area.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) define emotional labor as “the act of displaying the appropriate emotion” (p. 90). The very idea of an “appropriate emotion” suggests that there are expectations about how one should and should not behave within a given set of circumstances (Hochschild, 1983). These expectations are what establish display rules for how and to what degree certain emotions should be managed as part of one’s role or job (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). Although managing emotions in order to conform to social norms and expectations is a fairly innocuous practice, publicly managing emotions to achieve profitable gains has its share of drawbacks (Hochschild).

What distinguishes emotional labor from other emotional experiences is that, with emotional labor, emotions are “commodified” into a product that can be marketed and exchanged (Fineman, 2000; Putnam & Mumby, 1993). The sales professional who is rewarded by remaining friendly and courteous at all times, the teacher who is evaluated on his/her ability to establish a positive class environment in which students can learn, or the medical professional who is trained to suppress feelings of intense sadness, guilt, frustration or sorrow when a patient has died, even though he or she may be genuinely experiencing these emotions, are just a few examples of how individuals are paid to manage their feelings for the benefit of the organization and the overarching profession or industry. In the context of organizations, and particularly that of organizational change, the display of appropriate emotions is thought to help build employee momentum for the change, thereby achieving greater productivity overall. However, the intensity and frequency with which people must display expected emotions, particularly if those

emotions are not genuinely felt, can have adverse implications (e.g., Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Hochschild, 1983; Mann, 1997).

Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) argue that “what is functional for the organization may well be dysfunctional” for those engaged in emotional labor (p. 96). Much of the research in this area has consistently linked the experience of emotional labor to a number of negative, work-related outcomes, including job dissatisfaction (Abraham, 1998, 1999; Kruml & Geddes, 2000a; Locke, 1976), task ineffectiveness (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993), job stress (Kahn, 1981), voluntary turnover (Abraham, 1998; Wright & Cropanzano, 1998), reduced commitment (Abraham, 1999), role conflict (Zerbe, 2000), inauthenticity of self (Erickson & Ritter, 2001), and burnout (e.g., Kruml & Geddes, 2000a; Maslach, 1982; Miller et al., 1995; Morris & Feldman, 1996; Tolich, 1993; Wharton, 1993). Strong norms of emotional control within an organization may further lead to an environment where members are afraid to share information, voice honest opinions and disagreement, and/or resist behaviors that are antithetical to the original ideals and values of the organization (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995; Miller, 2002; Putnam & Mumby, 1993), all of which can have a negative impact on innovation and decision-making processes within the organization.

On the contrary, there is additional evidence to suggest that emotional labor can reduce stress and increase task effectiveness (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993) as well as have a positive, empowering effect on individuals’ well-being (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993), self-efficacy (Tolich, 1993), and overall perceptions of the job (Tracy & Tracy, 2000; Wharton, 1993). In their study of 911 dispatchers, Schuler and Sypher (2000) discovered that some of the most rewarding aspects of the dispatcher role were connected

to the performance of emotional labor, prompting individuals to further relish and seek out such experiences. Conrad and Witte (1994) point to a number of studies in the emotion and health literature which suggest that individuals can achieve healthier lives by merely acting positive, even if they do not feel positive or cheerful at the time.

Display rules can also allow members to distance themselves from their authentic emotions and maintain some sense of emotional equilibrium (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). Human service workers (i.e., doctors, nurses, social workers), in particular, appear to benefit from maintaining a level of “detached concern” in coping with the more difficult and emotionally trying aspects of their jobs (Miller et al., 1995; Schuler & Sypher, 2000; Smith & Kleinman, 1989). Thus, suppressing certain feelings may preclude professionals from having to bear intense emotions that potentially can lead to additional stress and burnout.

Researchers have argued that what makes emotional labor more intense and, perhaps, more likely to result in negative outcomes are situations in which individuals experience greater incongruence between emotions they feel and those they are expected to express (Morris & Feldman, 1996). According to Ashforth and Humphrey (1993), expressing emotions that are not genuinely felt requires a form of surface acting which can lead to an emotional dissonance that leaves individuals feeling inauthentic and somewhat hypocritical. *Emotional dissonance* is thought to be one dimension of emotional labor in which the emotions prescribed by a particular role and/or organization are perceived to be in conflict with an individual’s true, authentic feelings (Abraham, 1998; Kahn et al., 1964; Middleton, 1989; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). Although Hochschild (1983) believed that the detached emotions of surface acting would serve to protect

individuals from experiencing stress and burnout, recent findings suggest that the dissonance which stems from surface acting may lead to greater burnout and emotional exhaustion than deep acting (Kruml & Geddes, 2000a). This research supports a number of previous studies which have also shown clear and distinctive links between emotional dissonance and emotional exhaustion (Abraham, 1998, 1999; Morris & Feldman, 1997).

Yet, much like cognitive dissonance, individuals are uncomfortable with the emotional inconsistencies they experience and, as such, may attempt to reconcile any dissonance they feel. Attempting to reduce dissonance, however, poses additional challenges for many individuals in that they can express, or suppress, the required emotion and risk feeling duplicitous, or they can avoid emotional norms through their emotional deviance and risk being reprimanded, demoted, or even terminated from the organization (Abraham, 1998; Planalp, 1999). Emotional deviance occurs when individuals choose to express genuine emotions while disregarding those mandated by the organization or role (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). Still other individuals resort to a second dimension of emotional labor that Kruml and Geddes (2000b) identify as *emotive effort*. Emotive effort typically takes the form of active deep acting in which members attempt to actually invoke the emotions they are expected to display. To the extent that individuals are able to bring their genuine emotion in line with what is expected, they are less likely to feel dissonant and experience the often negative implications that can ensue. Even though active deep acting can certainly make members more susceptible to fully experiencing the emotional highs and lows of their role and the organization, preliminary research has shown that the emotive effort put forth when deep acting may serve to reduce burnout (Kruml & Geddes, 2000a).

Why emotional labor holds positive and rewarding outcomes in some instances but not in others underscores the complexity of this phenomenon and is an issue that remains largely unexplored within the literature. Although calls have been made to reexamine the emotional labor construct, research has only just begun to unveil the various dimensions and antecedents of emotional labor that would suggest why individuals' experience of emotional labor can be so vastly different (Kruml & Geddes, 2000b; Morris & Feldman, 1996, 1997; Wharton, 1993). Yet, as research increasingly paints a more comprehensive picture of emotional labor, it becomes all the more imperative for scholars to not only examine consequences of emotional labor but also the various factors that would lead members to engage in one form of emotional labor over another. Extending Kruml and Geddes' (2000b) study on antecedents of emotional dissonance and emotive effort, this study seeks to further develop our understanding of emotional labor by examining why and how individuals manage their labor differently. That is, what leads certain individuals to engage in deep acting and not surface acting? Why do some members experience more emotional dissonance than others? Beyond the many obvious personal, individual characteristics such as one's personality, affectivity, age, and gender, what are other factors the organization could conceivably manage to increase employees' awareness of their own emotional labor and to help them manage emotions in a way that minimizes the potential negative outcomes?

Antecedents of Emotional Labor

Hochschild's initial work addresses the potential impact that different personal and job related characteristics have on members' experience of emotional labor. A later model proposed by Rafaeli and Sutton (1989) further suggests that emotional expression

is determined by primarily three factors: (a) individual characteristics, (b) organizational role and (c) organizational norms/culture. Using their model as a launching point, this study seeks to extend our understanding of the different factors that ultimately contribute to emotional displays by considering different individual, organizational/contextual and even communicative characteristics that shape the performance of emotional labor.

Although scholars have certainly acknowledged the significance of some of these factors, studies to date have not attempted to link them with the different acting types associated with the performance of emotional labor. Yet, given the need for a more comprehensive and cohesive model of emotional labor, additional exploration of these relationships seems warranted.

Individual Factors

Indeed, studies have shown there to be a number of individual characteristics that can influence the extent to which people express certain emotions and ultimately experience the different effects of emotional labor, including gender (Kruml & Geddes, 2000b), age (Kruml & Geddes, 2000b), role identity (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993), self-monitoring (Abraham, 1998, 1999), affectivity (Abraham, 1998; Morris & Feldman, 1996), self-efficacy, and, perhaps most recently, emotional intelligence (Abraham, 2000). This study aims to explore several of these individual characteristics.

Role identity. Researchers argue that a number of job or role-related characteristics can contribute to emotional labor, including job autonomy/control (Abraham, 1998, 2000; Morris & Feldman, 1996), power of the role receiver, and task variety (Morris & Feldman, 1996). Specifically, research suggests that the routine nature of service interactions leads to greater emotional dissonance, while job autonomy is

shown to be negatively related to emotional dissonance (Morris & Feldman, 1997).

Moreover, Kruml and Geddes (2000b) found that factors such as the latitude people have to display genuine emotion, the extent to which there is emphasis on the quality of work, and the amount of emotional attachment to customers, all influenced the degree to which individuals experienced emotional labor, whether it was through dissonance or emotive effort.

Others have emphasized the need to look more closely at role identity, arguing that the more members identify with their work role, the less likely they are to experience the negative effects of emotional labor (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). Comparable to Morris and Feldman's (1997) notion of role internalization, role identity refers to how psychologically vested people are in their role and the extent to which they take on the demands and characteristics of their job as their own (Ashforth, 2001). Social identity theory (SIT) claims that for individuals to identify with a specific group or role, they must perceive that group to be salient and be psychologically vested in the group's outcomes (Ashforth; Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Given the amount of time and psychological investment required by certain roles, individuals' jobs are often a reflection of their valued and salient social identity (Mann, 1997; Van Maanen & Kunda, 1989). For those whose role represents a valued identity, emotional labor becomes a way to play out and further enhance that identity. For individuals who do not identify strongly with their role, emotional labor may serve to threaten their true sense of self (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993).

Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) argue that organizational members who view their role as being central to who they are as an individual are more likely to experience

authentic emotion even when conforming to display rules. This sense of authenticity is parallel to what Barnard (1938) refers to as the “zone of indifference”; that is, the more members identify themselves in terms of their role, the less role demands they are likely to perceive, the more authentic they feel in expressing or even suppressing certain kinds of emotions. Thus, depending on the extent of their identification, some individuals may need only to engage in passive deep acting to manage what little emotional labor they do experience. Others who strongly identify may seek to be more active with their deep acting and put forth more effort in trying to genuinely feel what the role demands of them.

Although some scholars have sought to examine the influence that identities have on emotional labor practices (see Miller, 2002; Tracy, 2002), there continues to be a lack of empirical evidence that would speak to how people attempt to manage their emotional labor based on their level of identification with their role or job. Kruml and Geddes (2000b) propose that the more attached individuals are to their customers, the more likely they are to either express their genuine feelings or at least try to feel the emotions they are expected to express. Likewise, it seems reasonable to argue that the more emotionally attached people are to their role, the more likely they will want to maintain that valued identity and seek alignment for their true feelings by engaging in some form of deep acting, whether that be passively, through emotional harmony, or actively through greater emotive effort. Because the performance of emotional labor is so often tied to rewards and compensation, those required to manage their feelings in such a way are likely to feel greater pressure to internalize and identify with their role (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995).

For the individual who is charged with implementing change, this may very well be the case.

The amount of time, energy, and effort that must be put forth in communicating change and in motivating others to act further points to the potential emotional investment many managers must make in their role as change implementer. In many instances of change, implementers are required to put on a positive and enthusiastic face for change even if they do not feel like it. Although individuals in this role may be instructed to acknowledge and perhaps even appreciate others' resistance to change, much of the practitioner literature dealing with resistance to change still suggests that managers find ways to "deal" with such resistance and offers prescriptions for minimizing the potential for resistance to occur, even if they have some genuine concerns and fears of their own. If change agents identify more readily with their implementation role, then they might be more willing to conform to whatever display rules are necessary and perhaps be less cognizant of any discrepant feelings they may have. To further test these claims, the following hypothesis is posed:

H1: Implementers who identify strongly with their role will be more likely to manage their emotional labor through deep acting.

Emotional intelligence has more recently been cited as having an impact on members' experience of emotion at work. Emotional intelligence can be defined as the ability to monitor one's emotional environment and to leverage that knowledge in guiding one's thoughts and actions (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Although there continues to be a significant dearth of empirical evidence that would substantiate many of the claims made about emotional intelligence or its proposed dimensions (for exception see

Davies, Stankov, & Roberts, 1998), emotional intelligence has become a burgeoning area of research that further advocates the power of individual characteristics on the experience of emotions in the workplace (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002; Ashkanasy & Tse, 2000; Davies et al.).

For example, Abraham (2000) discovered that emotional intelligence, in conjunction with the degree of autonomy members have over their work, positively impacted job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Jordan, Ashkanasy, and Hartel (2002) further developed a model which claims that individuals who are low in emotional intelligence are more likely to experience negative emotional reactions to job insecurity than those who are high in emotional intelligence.

Empathy. One of the proposed dimensions of emotional intelligence that helps to advance our understanding of how emotions are managed in the workplace is the ability to empathize with others (Goleman, 1998; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). In their study on empathy and burnout, Miller et al. (1995) distinguish between two types of empathy: emotional contagion (feeling with someone) and empathic concern (feeling for someone). Their findings revealed that empathy was indirectly related to burnout, which, considering the relationship between empathy and emotive dissonance, may very well signal a relationship to emotional labor (Kruml & Geddes, 2001b).

Given that the very notion of empathy is based on individuals' ability to put themselves in another's shoes, so to speak, and attempt to feel what others are feeling, it seems reasonable to argue that empathy is a critical and necessary factor in determining how individuals manage their emotional labor and perhaps account for why some managers might experience more or less dissonance in leading others through a change

effort. In assessing these claims, Kruml and Geddes (2000b) further examined these dimensions of empathic ability and discovered that people who were able to feel with others through emotional contagion, rather than simply for others, experienced less emotional dissonance and exerted greater emotive effort through deep acting. As such, it would seem that emotional contagion would be more predictive of deep acting. Conversely, because showing concern for someone rather than feeling with them allows for a certain level of emotional detachment, this study argues that empathic concern is likely to be more predictive of surface acting. Thus, the following hypotheses are offered:

H2: Implementers who exhibit greater empathic concern (i.e., feeling for) for others will be more likely to engage in surface acting.

H3: Implementers who experience greater emotional contagion (i.e., feeling with) will be more likely to engage in deep acting.

Individuals with higher emotional intelligence are also thought to be more adept at monitoring and adapting their emotions to fit the behavioral cues of others in different social contexts. If that is the case, then the ability to self-monitor may be yet another individual characteristic that helps to predict how emotional labor is performed.

Self-monitoring. As Abraham (1999) points out, it is somewhat difficult to assess the impact that self-monitoring has on emotional labor a priori. She argues that if members are truly desirous to align their displays of emotion with what is required by the organization, then high self-monitors may be able to achieve better balance between what is felt and what is expected. On the other hand, high self-monitors could actually experience greater disconnect if self-monitoring is simply a means by which to manage impressions and/or an attempt to live up to the expectations of the role and of others.

Using a similar construct known as “facades of conformity” Hewlin (2003) argues that high self-monitors are likely to create greater distinctions or facades in their behavioral expressions (i.e., gestures, emotions, dress). Creating these distinctions can further promote surface acting behaviors that might ultimately lead to greater emotional dissonance. Abraham (1999) examined the moderating influence of self-monitoring on emotional dissonance and job satisfaction and discovered that high self-monitors were more adversely affected by emotional dissonance than low self-monitors. From such findings, it seems reasonable to conclude that high self-monitors are less inclined to internalize the different dimensions of their roles and, thus, more likely to manage their emotional labor through surface acting rather than deep acting.

However, it is difficult to lay stake in such a claim from only one study. In a previous study, Abraham (1998) examined the same set of relationships only to discover that self-monitoring failed to achieve any significance at all. She attributes this to the fact that her sample consisted mainly of lower level employees rather than mid- to upper-level managers who, by their nature, are more likely to self-monitor their interactions with others. If that is the case, then change managers higher up in the organizational chain, who are expected to demonstrate greater emotional intelligence and be able to adapt to the different emotions and needs of their associates, should rate higher on self-monitoring. It is the degree to which self-monitoring influences their management of emotions that remains a critical question. While Abraham (1999) has clearly identified at least an indirect relationship between self-monitoring and emotional dissonance, this study further explores that relationship by assessing the extent to which self-monitoring

predicts the ways in which implementers perform their emotional labor. To that end, the following hypothesis is offered:

H4: Self-monitoring will predict a significant amount of variance in how implementers manage their emotions (i.e., surface acting, deep acting).

One factor that may further impact the relationship between self-monitoring and how individuals manage their emotions is the extent to which individuals identify with their role. While some might argue that high self-monitoring naturally leads to a separation of private and public self, it could also be that the more managers identify with their role as implementers, the more likely they are to internalize that role and, thus, attempt to use self-monitoring as way of further aligning genuine emotions with what is expected. Likewise, even if managers are considered high self-monitors, the less attachment they feel towards their role, the less inclined they may be to genuinely display the expected emotion and, instead, conform to display rules through surface acting. As such, this study posits:

H5: The interaction between self-monitoring and role identification will explain a significant amount of variance in implementers' attempt to deep act.

Efficacy. Self-efficacy refers to the perception of one's ability to execute a specific task or series of actions (Bandura, 1977, 1995). Perceptions of efficacy have the power to significantly influence how people think, behave and motivate themselves to act. By definition, then, the very presence of self-efficacy is indicative of one's ability to regulate and manage emotion. Given that efficacious individuals are likely to be more motivated in accomplishing tasks, it seems reasonable to argue that managers who experience greater self-efficacy in their roles as change implementers would also be more

motivated and empowered to perform to the expectations of the organization. If this is, indeed, the case, then one would expect that highly efficacious managers would also be more likely to conform to display rules, whether that is through surface or deep acting. As such, the following hypothesis is offered:

H6: The more efficacious managers are in their role as implementers, the more likely they will conform to specific display rules/emotive norms (i.e., surface acting, deep acting).

The influence that these individual characteristics can have on the performance of emotional labor represent only a fraction of a much larger equation related to how individuals manage emotion. Given the influence that organizations, themselves, can have in shaping emotional expression, other factors pertaining to the organizational context and environment need also be considered.

Contextual Factors

According to affective events theory, different features of the work environment also give rise to affective reactions (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). As such, the mere presence of change within an organization may serve as a catalyst for different emotional displays and ways of managing emotional labor. Specifically, this study focuses on the routine nature of change in the organization as well as the perceived impact or consequences associated with a given change.

Routineness of change. The mere frequency or “routineness” of change may further influence emotion management behaviors among change implementers. Routineness of change in an organization can often lead to a culture in which members come to anticipate and expect changes to occur on a regular basis. In such organizations

(e.g., high-tech, start-ups), employees are encouraged to embrace change and often times see change as a cultural norm for creating a viable and competitive company. Rather than be in violation of the norms that exist, it would seem that members of such organizations choose to either terminate their employment or actively manage their behavior to meet cultural expectations.

This study contends that the more routine change is within the organization, the more people will come to learn and accept change as part of the daily culture and normative “ways of being.” Assuming this is true, it is likely that the more people are faced with change, the more they learn to cope with the emotionality of change and, consequently, are less likely to be affected by the dissonance that can ensue from having to express and suppress emotions as part of the change process. In the case of implementers, it could be that the more managers are faced with having to implement change, the more they come to accept and integrate emotive norms as merely part of “what they do” and, over time, begin to feel less discrepancy overall between their own genuine emotions and those that are expected in their role as implementer. Even if there are such discrepancies, a higher frequency of change may further compel managers to actively deep act because of the amount of time and energy they have invested in their roles as implementers thus far.

Although there is no known research to date that would lend further justification to these claims, the question of whether the proliferation of change within an organization makes a difference in how implementers deal with the emotionality of change is a critical one for scholars and practitioners to ask because it may serve as a likely explanation for

why, and the degree to which, implementers seek to reconcile themselves to the emotional demands of change. Thus, this study hypothesizes:

H7: The more routine change is within the organization, the more implementers will engage in deep acting.

Perceived consequences of change. In addition to the overall frequency of change, the stakes that are involved with any given change effort may very well alter how implementers deal with their emotive states. Managers often find themselves in a more precarious position because they are the critical link between the vision of a change effort and its execution. Since the success of a change effort rests on managers' abilities to exhort and motivate others, they are likely to perceive higher stakes and are more likely to resort to the emotional controls of the organization as a result (Turnbull, 1999).

Thus, if the effects of organizational change are far-reaching in terms of market impact and carry more serious implications for employees both professionally and personally (e.g., job security, threats to advancement, loss of market share), it is likely that implementers will do more to manage their emotions, either through surface acting or deep acting, in order to preserve their jobs and avoid jeopardizing the many factors at stake. However, if changes in the organization are perceived as being relatively minor and fairly innocuous in terms of their impact, implementers will be less likely to actively manage their emotions and, in fact, may be more likely to deviate from emotive norms by expressing emotions they genuinely feel. To further test this theory, the following hypothesis and research question are posed:

H8: The more serious the consequences of a given change effort are perceived to be, the more likely implementers will be to actively conform to display rules (i.e., surface acting or deep acting).

Communicative Factors

Through socialization processes, members learn what emotional behaviors are appropriate within the organization's culture, in carrying out their particular role, and in managing different organizational events like change. Organizational discourse surrounding organizational change is designed to "socialize" individuals to the change by providing them with a better understanding and vision for the change. However, Waldron (1994) argues that such norms also have the power to bias individuals' assessments to the point where members' doubt and resistance towards the change is suppressed and reframed as mere excitement rather than fear. Unfortunately, in such cases, legitimate problems with strategy and how to best implement the change may be masked and never brought to bear until it is too late and the change effort has failed. It is for this very reason that business leaders and academics alike should continue to understand the influence emotive norms have on how members manage their emotions during such efforts.

Certainty of display rules. Individuals begin to learn and inculcate emotive norms, or display rules, into their work practices either informally through daily observations and interactions, or formally, through organized training programs and explicit policies (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). Depending on the organization or larger industry, some display rules are conveyed more explicitly than others, which may have additional implications for how and to what degree individuals engage in emotional labor. Research suggests that the more gain the organization believes it will achieve by controlling certain emotional

behaviors, the more explicit it is in socializing members to such “rules” (Van Maanen & Kunda, 1989), particularly through formalized methods such as training and various corporate communications (e.g., newsletter, formal feedback, handbooks; Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Kruml & Geddes, 2000b; Van Maanen & Kunda).

However, Miller (2002) argues that the role of emotions for individuals other than frontline service workers is less clear. Unlike those who occupy service positions, there are many professionals (e.g., doctors, nurses, professors) who are not formally socialized or given clear instructions for how to behave emotionally while on the job, yet they still perform emotional labor by either expressing or suppressing desired emotions. She further contends that what makes emotional labor distinct for individuals in non-traditional, service oriented professions such as these is the way in which emotive norms are infiltrated into their everyday behaviors. Rather than be explicitly told how to act through manuals, policies and/or extensive training, appropriate emotional behavior may be suggested through the very nature of the job, such as when a teacher intuitively knows to demonstrate patience and understanding for a struggling student, as well as through employees’ informal discussions and observations of one another. Change implementers are no exception to this.

Zorn (2002) discovered that individuals involved in the implementation of new communication technologies drew upon more generalized organizational rules in managing their emotional labor. Following Kramer and Hess’ (2002) rules of emotional expression in organizations today (i.e., avoid extreme emotional displays, express emotions to help others, express emotions to improve situations, and avoid expressing abusive emotions), his findings suggest that change agents relied upon these rules as a

guiding framework for managing the emotional environment of change around them, even though these rules were never formally communicated within the organization.

Although there is an increasing amount of practitioner-based literature that implicates the different skills leaders should exhibit in guiding others through change (e.g., charismatic, open-minded, motivating, positive, supportive), and how they should deal with others' resistance and fear towards change, such advice is fairly elusive and mostly prescriptive in nature (Lewis, Schmisseur, Stephens & Weir, 2003). Change agents may be able to take some subtle cues from the more popular literature on emotional intelligence and the need to be a transformational leader who empathizes with others, but this area of research has yet to amass much significant empirical evidence, especially in the arena of organizational change.

Given that there appears to be few explicit and universally known guidelines for how implementers should manage themselves and others emotionally during the change process, it would behoove scholars to first determine how implementers learn the emotive norms they display. What are change agents being told with respect to dealing with the emotional climate of change? Are these rules more formally conveyed, are they intuitive, or are they articulated through the informal employee networks? Such questions would not only help to more fully understand the ways in which less service oriented professions are socialized to emotion work, but, more specifically, they might also serve to address a larger gap within the organizational change literature regarding implementers' degree of preparedness in dealing with emotionality of change. As such, the following research questions have been posed:

R1: What are the emotive norms that govern the actions of change implementers?

R2: What are the ways (i.e., formally, informally) in which these norms are learned and shared?

The impact that more formalized rules have on members' performance of emotional labor is another question that researchers have begun to explore (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Morris & Feldman, 1996, 1997). For example, Kruml and Geddes (2000b) discovered that employees put forth more emotive effort when given formalized training, suggesting that the more explicit and formalized the communication surrounding the emotive norms in the organization, the more likely members are to view their emotional expressions as a critical component of the job and, thus, (i.e., active deep acting) put forth more effort in trying to convey the "appropriate" emotion.

However, Sutton and Rafaeli (1988) discovered that cashiers who underwent politeness training as part of an organization-wide campaign, were actually less likely to portray politeness due to the stress of a high volume and rapid work environment. Although context and environment can certainly influence the degree to which members adhere to the emotional requirements of the role, the contradiction in these findings also seem to suggest that the formality with which display rules are communicated may not be as relevant as the degree to which members enact and, thus, reinforce the norms or rules themselves.

Deeply reinforced display rules, whether communicated formally or informally, can further diminish the sense of control and latitude individuals perceive they have in expressing genuine emotions. Researchers argue that the degree of autonomy individuals have in their jobs reflects their ability to mold display rules into behaviors that are more constructive and consistent with their interpersonal style (Morris & Feldman, 1996;

Planalp, 1999). Thus, when display rules are more widely practiced and understood, there is likely to be less control and perceived autonomy in how one expresses emotions on the job, which may lead to a greater perceived distinction between the emotions that are prescribed and those that are more genuine in nature. Certainly, if dissonant members view display rules as being critical enough to the job, then they may seek to “fake in good faith” that, over time, may become an attempt to actively deep act and genuinely express certain emotions. However, this study contends that the more explicit and, thus, understood display rules are for implementing change, regardless of whether they are conveyed formally or informally, the less control implementers will perceive they have in managing their emotions and, thus, the more pressure they will feel to conform to the prescribed emotions through surface acting. Conversely, rules that are more loosely defined might afford greater flexibility in how implementers choose to manage and express their emotions, possibly leading them to engage in deep acting behaviors that create less emotional dissonance and more emotional authenticity overall. To further test these claims, this study posits:

H9: The more certain implementers are of the emotional norms required for successful implementation, the more likely they will engage in surface acting.

Perceived congruency of emotional expressions. As human beings, we have an innate desire to align or orient ourselves with others that ultimately serves as an impetus in the formation of interpersonal relationships. Co-orientation theory (McLeod & Chaffee, 1973) suggests that a person’s actions are not driven so much by their own attitudes and behaviors but by the perceived attitudes and behaviors of others around them. Applying this notion of co-orientation, it seems logical to argue that the perceived

congruency of emotional expression among coworkers can also play a role in how individuals manage emotional labor. More specifically, if individuals perceive their adherence to emotive norms, whether it is through surface acting or deep acting, parallels the normative beliefs and behaviors around them, then they are much more likely to continue managing their emotional labor in much the same way. However, if members perceive their performance of emotional labor to be inconsistent with their coworkers, then they are more likely to adjust their existing acting type to better “fit” the emotional attitudes and expression of others.

Given the somewhat temporal nature of the implementer’s role and the rather implicit communication surrounding display rules for implementation, it seems likely that change agents would have to rely on one another more closely for understanding and executing the emotive norms governing their role. If that is true, then they would also have a strong need to co-orient their emotive behaviors and, thus, might be more likely to conform to display rules in order to achieve or maintain such congruency. As such, the following hypothesis is posed:

H10: Perceived congruency among implementers’ expressed emotions will lead them conform to display rules (i.e., surface acting, deep acting).

One factor that may further influence the degree to which implementers seek congruency in their performance of emotional labor is self-monitoring. Given their need and ability to adapt their behavior to the individuals and circumstances around them, it is likely that implementers who are also high self-monitors would experience an even greater need to co-orient and align their emotional expressions with others, regardless of how they may genuinely feel. Of course, this could lead them to engage in either deep or

surface acting. Conversely, because they tend to be more behaviorally consistent across contexts, change implementers who perceive incongruency, yet who are low self-monitors would be more inclined to express what they genuinely felt, regardless of the emotive norms that were being displayed by those occupying the same role. In light of these arguments, the following hypothesis is posited:

H11: Self-monitoring will further moderate the relationship between congruency of expressed emotions and implementers' inclination to conform to display rules (i.e., surface acting, deep acting).

Finally, theories and extant research point to the influence that these different individual, organizational and communicative factors can have on implementers' emotion management behaviors, there is little, if any, indication as to which set of factors may be more predictive of how emotional labor is performed and the extent to which implementers conform to emotional display rules. However, identifying the relative strength of these factors on emotional labor would not only contribute to our current theories and understanding of emotional labor but doing so might also help organizations to target those sets of factors that can help members make better sense of their emotions on the job and, thus, manage them more effectively and authentically. In the case of organizational change, such knowledge might allow scholars to prioritize a set of variables with which to begin gauging members' perceptions and reactions to change as well as their ability to cope with the emotionality of change efforts. Moreover, determining the predictive value of these different sets of factors as a whole might also serve a beginning point for training managers on how to better cope with their own

emotions during change while attempting to lead others through the process. To these ends, this study offers a final and parting research question:

RQ 3: Which set of factors, individual (i.e., empathy, self-monitoring, self-efficacy, role identification) organizational (i.e., perceived consequences of change, routineness of change) or communicative (i.e., certainty of display rules, perceived congruency of expression emotion) is most predictive of how implementers manage their emotions during a change effort (i.e., deep acting/surface acting)?

CHAPTER 3: METHOD

Methodologies come with their own limitations that must be weighed in conjunction with the researcher's objectives and the overall purpose of the study. Two primary objectives of this study were (a) to identify the emotive norms of change implementers and (b) to assess the predictive value of different individual, organizational, and communicative factors on the performance or management of emotional labor.

Keeping those objectives and other considerations in mind, such as the need to reach a diverse sample, the number of independent variables being tested, and the need for power in adequately assessing these tests, the use of survey methods (e.g. questionnaires, in-depth interviews) were clearly warranted in this case. Specifically, in-depth interviews were used to collect data in response to the open-ended research questions posed in this study, while questionnaires were distributed in gathering data regarding the various predictors of emotional labor. Given that each method was employed to address a unique set of questions, their initial purpose here was not to triangulate the data. Incidentally, however, results from this study suggest that data stemming from both methods can, in fact, be used to inform one another.

Participants and Procedures

Because managers are typically those responsible for directly implementing change, their perspective would prove necessary to our understanding of emotion management within the change context. Thus, the study population in this case consisted of managers representing the private and public sectors as well as various levels in the organization. Specifically, this study targeted mid- to upper-level managers who recently

implemented change (within the last three years) or who were currently responsible for managing change within their respective organizations.

The sampling frame for this study was generated through snowball sampling methods. Specifically, local chapters of such organizations as the International Society for Performance Improvement (ISPI), the American Management Association (AMA) and the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) were initially contacted for their permission to solicit participation at monthly meetings and post an electronic/online survey on their association websites. Solicitation consisted of informing members about the purpose and overall goals of the research as well as the benefits of participating. If interested, members were encouraged to leave a business card or contact the researcher by email. Over the course of a month, three different association meetings were attended and one organization agreed to have a link to the questionnaire posted on their main webpage.

Remaining participants were recruited by contacting key individuals within the researcher's professional network. These individuals were initially contacted either by phone or email and asked if they would be interested in participating in research related to the emotions of organizational change. Once individuals signaled their interest to participate, a follow-up email was sent that consisted of a brief introductory letter explaining the purpose of the study, who was eligible for participation (i.e., mid- to upper-level managers implementing change), how respondents could benefit by participating, and a direct link to the questionnaire. If individuals were interested in participating, they were instructed to click on the link provided for them. Once they clicked on the link, they were automatically connected to the first page of the

questionnaire that contained a more detailed description of the study, potential risks, contact information, and instructions for participating. Upon reading more about the purpose and procedure of the study, respondents were then able to advance to the subsequent screens by clicking on a “next” button provided for them at the bottom of each screen.

Within the initial email that was distributed by the researcher, potential participants were encouraged to forward the introductory letter and link onto others or provide the researcher with names and contact information of friends, family, and/or colleagues who they believe fit the participant profile. To calculate a more accurate response rate, those who forwarded the information on themselves were also asked to provide the researchers with the total number of people on their distribution list. Of the approximately 386 questionnaires that were known to have been distributed, 166 of them were returned for a 43% response rate. Of the 166 questionnaires that were returned, 141 questionnaires (85%) were deemed acceptable and complete enough for analysis. Although an exact reason for the 15% attrition rate cannot be given, the amount of uncompleted questionnaires was most likely due to response fatigue as well as unfamiliarity and awkwardness with answering questions regarding one’s emotions at work.

The sample was comprised of a diverse group of managers representing a number of different industries including hi-tech (22.5%), education (13.8%), healthcare (12.3%), utilities (4.3%), municipal government (3.6%), church/religion (2.9%). An additional 41% of the sample represented other industries outside these primary areas. The majority of participants (58%) worked in the for-profit sector, while 26% worked in government,

and another 17% worked in non-profit organizations. Fifty-seven percent of the sample was male and the remaining 43% was female. The average field tenure for respondents was 11-15 years (22.3%) even though much of the sample (32%) had worked for their respective organizations for three years or less. Interestingly, most respondents (28%) reported that they spend less than 20% of their time at work managing change, followed by a group of respondents (25%) who indicated that more than 70% of their time is spent managing change. Prior to answering a set of particular questions, respondents were asked to think of a recent change they had implemented in the last 2-3 years or were currently implementing. Approximately 40% of respondents reflected upon a change they were currently implementing. The most frequent type of change reported by participants was the implementation of new policies and procedures (15%), followed by the implementation of new systems (13%), the reorganization of a division or organization (11%), mergers (8%), and layoffs (6%). An additional 47% of the sample reported changes that did not fall within one of these concentrated areas. Despite the numerous types of change reported, an overwhelming 89% of participants viewed their particular scenario to be a major change.

Once individuals had completed the questionnaire, a concluding message appeared that thanked them for their participation and invited them to engage in a follow-up interview. If interested, participants were then instructed to email the researcher directly. Over the course of three months, a total of 16 moderately scheduled interviews were conducted. Seven of the interviewees were male and the remaining nine interviewees were female. Interviewees were first instructed to think about a particular change they were either currently implementing or had recently implemented, and then

tell the “story” of their experiences. To accomplish this, the interview schedule consisted of a set of predefined questions focusing on how emotions were communicated during the change effort (e.g., Describe your change scenario. What is the emotional climate in your workplace? How did the organizational initially communicate the change effort? What do you say to an employee who is complaining about the change? What emotions should an effective manager express during a change effort? How do you know what to say and how to say it? Describe any training you may have received regarding how to manage emotions of self and others during change? (For complete schedule, see Appendix A). Although these core questions were consistently asked across interviews, new questions were generated, and others omitted, as relevant topics emerged. Interviews were conducted in person or over the phone and, depending on the breadth and depth of topics introduced by the interviewee, lasted an average of 30 minutes to one hour. All interviews were audio-recorded and copious notes were taken by the researcher. Although entire word-for-word transcriptions were not generated at this time, verbatim accounts reflecting patterns of relevant issues were transcribed for each interview.

Since many of the questionnaire and interview questions indirectly asked respondents to indicate their feelings about their current job and organization, breach of confidentiality was identified as a potential risk. To further ensure anonymity with the questionnaire, participants were made aware that responses would not be tracked. The survey design program used in this study offered the option of protecting individual responses and, thus, did not use individual email addresses as an identifier once questionnaires were submitted. Thus, even though some identities of *potential* respondents might have been known, there was no way for the researcher to (a) know if

certain individuals had even participated or (b) attribute a set of responses to any particular individual. Participants were made aware that the completion and return of the questionnaire would be interpreted as their informed consent (Sieber, 1992).

Anonymity, of course, was not possible for interview participants. However, these individuals were reassured that comments shared within the interviews would remain confidential and that only the researcher would be transcribing and analyzing the interview data. Once the risks and benefits of participating in the interview were explained, individuals were then asked to give their written consent. For interviews that were conducted over the phone, participants were instructed to read the consent form prior to the interview and then give their oral consent.

Design and Instrumentation

Given the study's focus on individuals' perceptions of emotions during organizational change, self-report measurement was an acceptable method to use. A web-based questionnaire consisting of 11 different sub-scales and 113 items was constructed to measure the following variables: role identification, empathy (i.e., emotional contagion, empathic concern), efficacy, self-monitoring, routineness of change, perceived consequences of change, certainty of display rules, congruency of emotional expression, surface acting and deep acting. Additional data reflecting the respondents' age, gender, organizational tenure, role tenure, type and frequency of media use, time spent managing change, as well as their attitudes and perceptions regarding change both before and after a particular change effort were also collected. With the exception of a few demographic variables, the majority of items were measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale (e.g., *Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree*).

The initial version of the questionnaire was pretested by a small, convenience sample of individuals outside the sample population (N=6) who were either currently implementing change or who had implemented change in the last three years. The purpose of this testing was to identify any problems with the sequencing and wording of questions as well to confirm the overall flow, timing, and functionality of the questionnaire. Once revisions were made to the original instrument, it was redistributed for actual data collection.

For established measures that had been modified or adapted to fit the change context, internal consistency and content validity were assessed through confirmatory factor analysis using AMOS 5.0 (Arbuckle, 2003). Maximum likelihood estimation was used in analyzing the internal consistency of all relevant measures. Retained items on each of these scales maintained acceptable reliabilities and factor loadings. An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) using SPSS 12.0 was also run to establish the factorial structure of the dependent measures (i.e., surface and deep acting). Because these measures are still in their early stages of development, EFA was deemed the more appropriate method. Following these initial analyses, all scales were subjected to further reliability testing using Cronbach's alpha. Items producing low inter-item correlations were ultimately dropped so that acceptable alpha reliabilities could be achieved (For a listing of item content, see Appendix B).

Dependent variables. *Surface acting* was operationalized as the extent to which individuals perceived themselves faking desired emotions while *deep acting* was operationally defined as the extent to which individuals attempt to actually feel the emotions they were expected to express. Although previous research by Kruml and

Geddes (2000b) attempts to address the multidimensional nature of emotion labor, there is still some question surrounding the validity of these measures and their identity as separate, albeit related, dimensions of emotional labor. To further test the dimensionality of emotional labor, an additional exploratory factor analysis was performed using 19 of the initial items developed by Kruml and Geddes. An additional seven items were constructed to measure perceived success of emotional labor and authenticity of emotional expression, resulting in a 26-item measure of emotional labor overall. All items were further modified to fit the change context (e.g., “I have to cover up my true feelings when managing others through this change effort,” “When it comes to implementing this change, I don’t express the same feelings to my employees that I feel inside”).

Research conducted by Kruml and Geddes (2000b) produced a moderate correlation ($r = .42$) between their two established dimensions of emotional labor (i.e. emotive dissonance and emotive effort). Thus, assuming that some degree of intercorrelation existed between factors, a principal components analysis with an oblique rotation was used for reassessing dimensionality of emotional labor in this case. Calculation of communality estimates ($>.05$; Field, 2000), the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin’s measure of sampling adequacy, and Bartlett’s test of sphericity indicated that the data was suitable for factor analysis. Once the potential for reliable factor solutions was determined, eigenvalues greater than one and scree plots were used to identify the number of factor solutions.

Rotation of the 26-item measure confirmed an initial three factor structure accounting for approximately 52% of the total variance. The first factor reflected

implementers' effort to align their own emotions with an expected or desired set of emotions (i.e., deep acting), while the second factor captured the degree of emotional attachment implementers feel towards their employees. The third factor represented implementers' effort to fake the emotions that are expected or desired (i.e., surface acting). Items that failed to load above .40, had negative loadings, or that loaded on both factors, were ultimately dropped from the measure. Adhering to these criteria resulted in the elimination of seven items. A second analysis was then conducted with the remaining items. Rotation of the 19-item measure revealed a two factor structure with acting types (i.e., surface and deep acting) loading on the first factor and items related to emotional attachment loading on the second factor. Although emotional attachment could be considered a possible antecedent to emotional labor, it does not represent the construct of emotional labor and, subsequently, failed to correlate with the other items on the emotional labor scale. As such, all five attachment items were removed from the measure. A third and final analysis was then conducted on the remaining 14-item measure of emotional labor. Rotation of the scale resulted in a 2-factor structure with surface acting loading on the first factor ($\alpha=.91$, 8 items) and deep acting loading on the second factor ($\alpha=.82$, 6 items). A significant and moderate correlation was found between the remaining two factors of surface acting and deep acting ($r=.50$). The determinant of the correlation matrix indicated no multicollinearity or singularity among these two factors, providing additional support for the belief that these may be related, yet somewhat distinct, aspects of emotional labor (see Kruml & Geddes, 2000b). Item content and factor loadings for the exploratory factor analyses are presented in Table 1.

Independent variables. *Role identification* was measured using several modified items from Cheney's (1982) and Mael and Ashforth's (1992) Organizational Identification Questionnaire (OIQ). Cheney's OIQ is originally a 25-item questionnaire constructed to measure three aspects associated with identification: membership, loyalty, and similarity (Patchen, 1970). Mael and Ashforth's questionnaire assesses social identity and the extent to which members see themselves in terms of their organizations. Given that the original questionnaires were designed to measure identification with the organization, wording on each of the items was modified to reflect a sense of attachment to one's role. Only those items that were the most clear and adaptable to the use of identification in this study were selected and rephrased to measure role identification. (e.g., "Most of my time is invested in my role as a manager/supervisor," "Being a manager/supervisor is a large part of who I am as a person"). Using this as an initial criterion, 11 items were retained for analysis. Each question asked respondents to indicate the extent to which they agreed with statements regarding their work role. Confirmatory factor analysis of the scale revealed low factor loadings for two of the 11 items. Once these items were removed, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) for the model reached .92, suggesting a fair amount of internal consistency and adequate fit overall. The CFI is one of several comparable indices assessing the fit of the data to the hypothesized model. However, Bentler (1990) contends that, despite their similarities, the CFI should be the choice index.

TABLE 1
Factor Loadings for Emotional Labor-Initial Factor Analysis of Items

<i>Item</i>	<i>Loading</i>		
	1	2	3
1. The feelings that I express as part of the change effort are the same as those I genuinely feel inside.-RC	.886		
2. When implementing this change, the emotions that I show to those I manage match what I truly feel.-RC	.847		
3. I have to cover up my true feelings when managing others through this change effort.	.846		
4. In terms of this change effort, I talk myself into expressing emotions that are different from what I genuinely feel.	.758		
5. I try to talk myself out of feeling what I really feel when managing others during this change.	.745		
6. When it comes to implementing this change, I don't express the same feelings to my employees that I feel inside.	.739		
*7. I tend to communicate what I genuinely feel, even when others I work with suggest how I should feel about the change.	-.735		
8. I typically fake the emotions I show when implementing this change.	.701		

<i>Item</i>	<i>Loading</i>		
	1	2	3
9. When implementing this change, I tend to hold back my true feelings and emotions in order to meet the expectations of the organization.	.572		
*10. I try not to alter my true feelings about the change, even if I think the organization would disapprove.	-.499		
11. If I think the organization would not approve of my real feelings about the change, I try to alter those feelings.	.468		
*12. When communicating this change, I typically express the emotions I want to express, regardless of what the organization may want me to express.	-.458		
13. When implementing this change, my employees typically know when I am covering up my true feelings.		.708	
14. When implementing this change, I tend get emotionally involved with the people that I manage.		.653	
*15. My employees cannot tell if I cover up my true feelings about this change.		-.644	
16. I am able to keep my feelings neutral when managing others through this change effort.		.639	
17. My job is to help lead others though this change process while maintaining my distance emotionally.		.467	
18. To implement this change, it takes a lot of effort for me to not care about my employees.		.420	

<i>Item</i>	<i>Loading</i>		
	1	2	3
*19. When interacting with my employees about this change, I remain emotionally detached from them.			
*20. When implementing this change, I am able to feel the emotions the organization expects me to express.	-.556		.792
21. When implementing this change, I attempt to create certain emotions within myself that are consistent with what the organization desires.			.688
22. When implementing this change, my employees believe that the emotions I convey are sincere, even if sometimes I know they are not.			.612
23. When trying to implement this change, if I pretend to be positive about it, then I can actually start to feel positive.			.609
24. When implementing this change, I try to change my actual feelings to match those that I know I need to express to my employees.			.525
25. I can alter my own feelings about the change when interacting with my employees.			.485
*26. When implementing this change, I work at conjuring up the feelings I need to show to those I manage.	.463		.479

Note. Asterisk * indicates items that were deleted after initial rotation.

Factor 1= Faking Emotion (Surface Acting); Factor 2=Emotional Attachment; Factor 3=Aligning Emotion (Deep Acting)

TABLE 1 (cont)**Item content and Factor Loadings for Emotional Labor -Second Factor Analysis**

<i>Item</i>	<i>Loading</i>	
	1	2
I try to talk myself out of feeling what I really feel when managing others during this change.	.827	
I have to cover up my true feelings when managing others through this change effort.	.805	
When it comes to implementing this change, I don't express the same feelings to my employees that I feel inside.	.779	
When implementing this change, I tend to hold back my true feelings and emotions in order to meet the expectations of the organization.	.761	
In terms of this change effort, I talk myself into expressing emotions that are different from what I genuinely feel.	.747	
I typically fake the emotions I show when implementing this change.	.729	
When implementing this change, I try to change my actual feelings to match those that I know I need to express to my employees.	.706	
If I think the organization would not approve of my real feelings about the change, I try to alter those feelings.	.706	

<i>Item</i>	<i>Loading</i>	
	1	2
The feelings that I express as part of the change effort are the same as those I genuinely feel inside.	.667	
When implementing this change, the emotions that I show to those I manage match what I truly feel.	.658	
I can alter my own feelings about the change when interacting with my employees.	.658	
When implementing this change, I attempt to create certain emotions within myself that are consistent with what the organization desires.	.645	
When trying to implement this change, if I pretend to be positive about it, then I can actually start to feel positive.	.587	
When implementing this change, my employees believe that the emotions I convey are sincere, even if sometimes I know they are not.	.455	
*When implementing this change, my employees typically know when I am covering up my true feelings.		.701
*When implementing this change, I tend get emotionally involved with the people that I manage.		.700
*I am able to keep my feelings neutral when managing others through this change effort.		.585

<i>Item</i>	<i>Loading</i>	
	1	2
*To implement this change, it takes a lot of effort for me to not care about my employees.		.513
*My job is to help lead others through this change process while maintaining my distance emotionally.		.444
<i>Note.</i> Asterisk * indicates deleted items—items did not correlate with other DV items and represent a variable not currently under investigation. Factor 1=Acting Types (surface and deep acting); Factor 2=Emotional Attachment		

TABLE 1 (cont)
Item Content and Factor Loadings for Emotional Labor-Factor Analysis of Acting Types

<i>Item</i>	<i>Loading</i>	
	1	2
When implementing this change, the emotions that I show to those I manage match what I truly feel.-RC	.917	
The feelings that I express as part of the change effort are the same as those I genuinely feel inside.-RC	.888	
I have to cover up my true feelings when managing others through this change effort.	.841	
When it comes to implementing this change, I don't express the same feelings to my employees that I feel inside.	.705	
I try to talk myself out of feeling what I really feel when managing others during this change.	.686	
In terms of this change effort, I talk myself into expressing emotions that are different from what I genuinely feel.	.676	
I typically fake the emotions I show when implementing this change.	.667	
When implementing this change, I tend to hold back my true feelings and emotions in order to meet the expectations of the organization.	.507	

<i>Item</i>	<i>Loading</i>	
	1	2
When implementing this change, I attempt to create certain emotions within myself that are consistent with what the organization desires.		.820
When trying to implement this change, if I pretend to be positive about it, then I can actually start to feel positive.		.712
When implementing this change, my employees believe that the emotions I convey are sincere, even if sometimes I know they are not.		.691
When implementing this change, I try to change my actual feelings to match those that I know I need to express to my employees.	.	.680
I can alter my own feelings about the change when interacting with my employees.		.648
If I think the organization would not approve of my real feelings about the change, I try to alter those feelings.		.538
<i>Note.</i> Factor 1=Surface Acting; Factor 2=Deep Acting		

The remaining nine items were further subjected to reliability testing using Cronbach's alpha. Low item-total correlations were revealed for three of the retained items. Once these items were removed, measurement reliability reached .73.

Self-monitoring, defined here as the ability to adapt one's behaviors and emotions to fit other persons and contexts, was measured using an adapted version of Lennox and Wolfe's (1984) multi-dimensional self-monitoring scale. Seven items from the original scale were used to assess the degree to which individuals can adjust their behavior to meet situational needs (e.g., "When I feel that the image I am portraying isn't working, I can readily change it to something that does," "I tend to change my behavior depending on the situation or person with whom I am interacting"). Results from the CFA revealed low factor loadings for three of the seven items. Once these items were dropped from the scale, a CFI of .99, suggesting strong internal consistency and an excellent fit of the model. Reliability for the remaining four-item scale was deemed adequate ($\alpha = .77$).

Empathy was measured in terms of individuals' *empathic concern* for others as well as the extent of *emotional contagion* experienced when interacting with others. Two different scales adapted by Miller, Stiff, and Ellis (1988) were used to assess these distinct aspects of empathy. Empathic concern is originally a five-item scale that assesses the extent to which individuals feel for other persons, while emotional contagion is originally a six-item instrument designed to measure the extent to which members feel with others. Once again, only those items that could be adapted to the present context were retained and were modified to reflect the perspectives of a manager or supervisor (e.g. "I am concerned about the feelings of the people I manage," "I tend to remain calm even when my team may worry"—reverse coded). Results from the CFA revealed low

factor loadings for one item on the empathic concern scale and two items on the emotional contagion scale. After one item on the empathic concern scale was removed, the CFI was .80, suggesting a mediocre fit of the model to the data. Although eliminating the additional low loadings on emotional contagion would have improved the overall fit, doing so would have further diminished the measurement's overall reliability. Therefore, the decision was made to keep them in the model. These analyses produced a final 4-item measure of empathic concern ($\alpha = .66$) and a final 5-item measure of emotional contagion ($\alpha = .61$).

Routineness of change was operationally defined as the degree to which members perceive change as a frequent and consistent event within the organization. Six items were developed that attempted to capture the frequency of change as it is defined here (e.g., "Procedures and policies are constantly in flux at this organization," "The organization frequently changes the way it does things"). Because this was a newly developed scale with a fairly small number of items, no CFA or EFA were conducted. One item produced a low item-total correlation during reliability analysis and was removed, resulting in a final 5-item measure with strong reliability ($\alpha = .88$).

Perceived consequences of change was a six-item scale designed to measure the extent to which individuals perceive that there is a great deal at stake, either to themselves or to the company, in successfully implementing change. As such, participants were asked to indicate the degree to which they perceive change as having an impact on both their personal and professional lives ("Success or failure of this change will have significant impact on the long-term viability of this organization," "Successful implementation of this change affects my promotability in the organization"). Again,

given the initial stages of this scale, no additional factorial analyses were run. Reliability testing revealed two items with low or inconsistent correlations. Once these were removed, Cronbach's alpha reached .81.

Certainty of display rules was a five-item scale developed to measure the degree to which the emotive norms surrounding participants' role as a change implementer were communicated and understood (e.g., "My boss is clear about what emotion I need to convey in order to get my team 'on board' with this particular change," "I have been told what I need to know about how to be a positive agent for change within this organization"). Although no CFA or EFA were conducted on this scale, reliability analysis revealed three items with low item-total correlations. All three questions were dropped, resulting in a 2-item measure ($\alpha=.65$).

Congruency of expressed emotions was operationalized as the extent to which individuals perceive alignment between their emotional displays and other change implementers' displays. Four items were created that attempted to capture members' perceptions about the congruency or agreement of their behavior with others (e.g., "When implementing this change, my fellow managers/supervisors and I encourage our employees in much the same way," "The behaviors I exhibit when trying to motivate my employees about this change are usually not the same as other managers/supervisors"—reverse coded). Reliability testing indicated one item with a low item-total correlation. Upon removing this item, final reliability reached .81.

Efficacy was an 8-item scale designed to measure the extent to which managers felt confident in their ability to successfully implement change. Questions were constructed based on a variety of key functions characterizing the change implementer's

role (e.g., “To what extent are you confident in your ability to sell the change successfully?” “To what extent are you confident in your ability to overcome objections that others have about the change?”) All items were retained, resulting in a reliability of .91.

Data Analysis

Following preliminary analyses of the data, stepwise and hierarchical regressions were run to test the hypotheses under investigation. Stepwise regression involves the entry of variables based on their simple correlation with the outcome. Using this as a criterion, a statistical software program (e.g., SPSS), and not the researcher, then searches for the predictor that best predicts the outcome and then retains it in the model. The program then searches for the next predictor with the largest semi-partial correlation with the outcome and enters it into the model. This process continues until there are no more significant predictors left to retain in the model (see Field, 2000). The stepwise approach is considered to be somewhat controversial because it does not acknowledge the theoretical import of certain predictors over others and, thus, takes some methodological control away from the researcher (Field, 2000). Nevertheless, stepwise can be an appropriate method for the type of exploratory model building being pursued in this study (Wright, 1997). Given there is little theoretical or empirical evidence to suggest which of the current predictors would explain the most and/or least amount of variance in the different criterion variables, stepwise regression was deemed an appropriate method for testing various relationships posed in this study.

Hierarchical regressions were also run in testing the different moderating effects posed in this study. This procedure involved the block entry of each variable into a

regression model to assess the relative impact of potential moderating variables (i.e., role identification and self-monitoring). Typically, potentially confounding variables that need to be controlled for are entered into the model in the first step, followed by the main variables of interest in the second step, and the interaction between each of these main variables in the third step.

Although the correlation matrices indicated no significant relationship between any of the demographic and criterion variables, a significant relationship was discovered between the amount of time implementers spend managing change and the extent to which they engage in deep acting. To control for this particular variable, a hierarchical regression was used to test the deep acting model. A significance level of $p < .05$ was used for all regression analyses.

Using principles of grounded theory, a thematic analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) of the interview data determined the content and manner by which managers come to learn and understand the emotive guidelines governing their implementation role. Although entire word-for-word transcriptions were not generated, verbatim accounts reflecting relevant issues were documented and then coded by the researcher.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

PART ONE

Means, standard deviations, and correlations for each variable of interest were computed and are reported in Table 2. Interestingly, only four out of the nine independent variables in this case were directly correlated with the dependent measures of surface and deep acting. However, given the somewhat exploratory nature of this study, each of the independent variables in the hypothesized regression models was retained. Tests of multivariate normality, linearity and homoscedasticity were also performed. Distributions on surface acting, efficacy, self-monitoring, certainty of emotive norms, congruence of emotive norms, and perceived consequences of change violated assumptions of normality. Square root or logarithm transformations were run on each of these scales and normality was restored. No assumptions of linearity or homoscedasticity were violated.

Deep acting model. As indicated, a hierarchical regression was run to test predictors associated with deep acting. Early analysis showed time spent managing change to be a significant correlate of deep acting among the descriptive, demographic variables. To control for its effects, it was entered into the first block of the model and found to be significantly predictive of deep acting [$t=2.0$, $p=.047$]. The remaining hypothesized predictors, including role identification, self-monitoring, emotional contagion, efficacy, congruency of emotive norms, routineness of change, and perceived consequences of change were then entered into the model at the second step. The overall model was significant explaining 16% of the variance in deep acting and an additional 13% of variance above and beyond what was accounted for by the control variable [$R^2=.16$, $F(8, 113)=2.74$, $p=.009$]. Two of the seven predictors in this model were shown

TABLE 2

^aRaw Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlation Coefficients

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
<i>Dependent Variables</i>												
(1) S. Acting	3.2	1.3										
(2) D. Acting	4.0	1.3	.67**									
<i>Independent Variables</i>												
(3) Routineness of Change	3.8	.39	.036	.043								
(4) Perceived Stakes	5.0	.44	-.085	-.021	-.15							
(5) Congruency of Norms	4.2	.35	.18*	.15	.25**	.12						
(6) Certainty of Norms	4.6	.34	.22*	.07	.12*	-.02	.41**					
(7) Role ID	4.4	.95	-.02	.20*	.006	-.07	-.23**	-.007				
(8) Empathic Concern	6.1	.65	-.11	-.13	.17*	-.08	.03	.03	.02			
(9) Emotional Cont.	3.0	.94	.07	.08	.16	.14	.064	.084	.09	.13		
(10) Efficacy	5.5	.13	.20*	-.03	.05	.11	.02	.27**	.009	-.11	.14	
(11) Self-monitoring	5.0	.29	-.12	-.25**	.09	.08	.02	-.002	-.15	.02	.183**	.264**

^a All means reflect averages prior to transformation; * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

to be significantly predictive of deep acting. *Self-monitoring* was found to be most predictive [$\beta = -.24$, $t = -2.6$, $p = .012$], followed by *role identification* [$\beta = .20$, $t = 2.2$, $p = .03$]. A third variable, *congruency of emotive norms*, approached significance [$\beta = .174$, $t = 1.9$, $p = .065$]. Thus, Hypotheses 1 and 4 were supported in this particular model. Efficacy, emotional contagion, routineness of change and perceived consequences of change were not significantly predictive of deep acting. Beta weights, t-statistics and significance levels of all hypothesized predictors of deep acting are presented in Table 3.

Additional hierarchical regressions were run to test the moderating effect between self-monitoring and role identification as well as between congruency of expressed emotions and self-monitoring. For the first interaction, five of the seven predictors of deep acting were entered into the model at the first step, followed by the main variables of role identification and self-monitoring. An interaction term between self-monitoring and role identification was created and entered into the model at the third step. Although the interaction between role identification and self-monitoring was significant [$R^2 = .16$, $F(8, 118) = 2.8$, $p < .01$], its entry into the model did not explain a significant amount of variance above and beyond that of the main variables [R^2 change = .02]. Thus, Hypothesis 5 was not supported.

In testing the second moderating effect, five of the seven predictors of deep acting were, once again, entered into the model in the first block, followed by the main variables of congruency of expressed norms and self-monitoring, and then the interaction term created between them. Again, while the interaction itself was significant [$R^2 = .14$, $F(8, 117) = 2.4$, $p < .05$], its entry into the model did not explain a significant amount of

TABLE 3**Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses: The Impact of Key Predictors on Deep Acting**

Variable Blocks	R^2	Change in R^2	F	B	β	t
<u>Step 1 Variables</u>						
Time Spent Managing Change	.032	.032	4.028*	.095	.18	2.0*
<u>Step 2 Variables</u>						
	.162	.13	2.735**			
Role Identification				.26	.20	2.2*
Self-monitoring				-1.0	-.24	-2.6**
Emotional Contagion				.15	.11	1.2
Efficacy				.26	.03	.30
Congruency of Norms				.63	.20	1.9
Routineness of Change				-.06	-.02	-.20
Perceived Stakes in Change				-.03	-.009	-.10

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

variance above and beyond that of the main variables [R^2 change=.001]. Thus,

Hypothesis 11 was not supported in this model.

Surface acting model. A stepwise regression was run to test predictors associated with surface acting. Unlike the deep acting model, none of the descriptive, demographic data proved to be correlated with surface acting and, thus, were not controlled for in this model. Again, in light of the paucity of evidence that would suggest which of the hypothesized predictors explain a greater amount of variance, stepwise method was considered to be a useful means by which to test, and hopefully build, this particular model. Six variables, certainty of emotive norms, empathic concern, congruency of expressed norms, perceived consequences of change, self-monitoring and efficacy, were all entered into the model simultaneously. An initial omnibus F- test indicated the overall model to be significant, explaining 13% of the variance in surface acting [$R^2=.13$, $F(6, 124) = 3.12$, $p<.01$]. Of the six predictors that were entered into the model, one was found to be significantly predictive of surface acting. *Certainty of emotive norms*, was most predictive explaining approximately 5% of the variance [$R^2=.048$, $F(1, 129) = 6.47$, $p<.05$]. Thus, Hypothesis nine was supported in this model. An additional variable, *efficacy*, approached significance [$\beta=.15$, $t=1.7$, $p=.09$]

A hierarchical regression was also used to test the interaction effect posed between congruency of emotive norms and self-monitoring on surface acting. As such, certainty of emotive norms, empathic concern, perceived consequences of change, and efficacy were all entered into the model on the first step. The main variables of self-monitoring and congruency of norms were entered into the model at the second level,

followed by the interaction term at the next level. No significant interaction was found [R^2 change=.006] above and beyond the contribution made by the main variables into the model [R^2 =.14, $F(6, 123)$ =3.2, $p < .01$]. Thus, Hypothesis 11 was not supported in this model either. Beta weights, t-statistics and significance levels of all hypothesized predictors of surface acting are presented in Table 4.

In response to the third research question, a standard multiple regression was run to test the effects of each of these predictors, as a collective (i.e., individual, contextual and communicative), on how implementers manage their emotional labor (i.e., surface acting, deep acting). Of the three sets, or categories, of variables represented in this study, communication was shown to be the only significant predictor for the surface acting model [β = .256, t =2.9, p =.005]. No categories were found to be predictive in the deep acting model.

TABLE 4**Summary of Stepwise Regression Analyses: The Impact of Key Predictors on Surface Acting**

Variables	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F	B	β	t
General Model	.13	.09	3.128**			
Certainty of Display Rules/ Emotive Norms	.05	.04	6.47**	.86	.22**	2.5
Empathic Concern					-.11	-1.3
Efficacy					.15	1.7
Self-monitoring					-.12	-1.4
Congruency of Norms					.10	1.1
Perceived Stakes in Change					-.08	-.93

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

RESULTS: PART TWO

The first two research questions posed in this study were designed learn more about (a) the emotive norms that govern the actions and behaviors of change implementers and (b) how implementers come to learn and integrate those norms into their work practices. In addressing these questions, a thematic analysis was conducted using a constant comparison method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss, 1987). This method requires the analyst to code discursive incidents into categories while comparing them to previous incidents within the research. Through a series of coding, comparing, and then recoding, theoretical properties of each category begin to emerge, as do new categories. In the present study, interviews were loosely transcribed and emerging themes related to the specific research questions were then identified by the researcher.

The first step of this iterative process involved open coding in which the data were analyzed for similarities and differences. As discursive patterns were discovered within the data, a new category would be established or revised until no additional modification was required. In the second step of the analysis, the researcher identified themes that emerged out of categories most relevant to the specific research questions posed in this study. This process involved, once again, the comparison of emerging themes with previously established themes to identify discursive patterns within the data. As different patterns emerged, new themes and, in some instances, new categories were created. As a final step, the researcher reread all transcriptions and coding to further establish the accuracy and consistency of the initial analysis. Any themes that seem to

overlap with one another at this point were collapsed into one theme and renamed accordingly.

Although the analysis of the interviews revealed several distinct categories, only two categories, *emotive norms* and *methods for acquiring norms*, pertained to the specific research questions addressed in this study and, thus, were further analyzed for additional sub-themes.

Emotive Norms

In response to the first research question regarding the emotive norms of change implementers', 11 themes initially emerged from the data. Those 11 themes were then reassessed for any additional overlap and collapsed accordingly. Based on this second phase of analysis, five themes related to the emotional norms of implementers were established: Emotional Restraint, Directness/Honesty, Empathy/Compassion, Positive/Empowering, and Detachment. Descriptions of these themes and the corresponding excerpts from interviewees¹ below are arranged based on their predominance within the data.

Emotional restraint. The restraint or suppression of emotion was clearly one of the more primary norms to which managers adhered when implementing change. As one participant, Joe*, indicated, "I don't get mad—life's too short. If I get mad at work very often, then I do need to go somewhere else, so I try not to get mad at work."

This statement echoes the sentiment of most participants at one time or another. Myriad questions were asked regarding how they responded emotionally to their team during a change effort. While respondents did not necessarily overtly state the need to

¹ Names of all interviewees have been changed to protect their identity and are noted with an asterisk (*) upon their initial introduction into the text.

suppress or restrain themselves, the need to “be professional” and the ramifications for not managing their emotive behaviors were evident across respondents, regardless of their respective industries or status within the organization.

For example, one manager, Dave*, stated “You have to be somewhat interfocused where you don’t complain. You don’t let other people know that things that you’re doing are also... are a pain in the ass.” At one point, when asked about the different emotions experienced at work, another respondent,*Lisa, commented, “I will never inflict my own stress or my own whatever on someone else. It’s not fair, it’s not effective.”

As CEO of a small company, Connie* readily discussed her perspective on emotional restraint:

I have to remain professional in everything that I do, throughout the job—it’s really how I interact and deal with the people that I support. You have to manage your behavior. You can’t stay frustrated with one person and then pick up the phone and have this frustrated tone with this other person.

Moreover, when asked how she communicates with staff members who complain about different aspects of the change, another manager named Helen* noted, “I don’t push back, I don’t ever push back with anybody. I think ‘push back’ a lot of times. In my mind, I’m saying ‘you son of a bitch’.” This particular comment, while clearly illustrative of managers’ perceived need to restrain their own emotions in order to manage the emotions of others, further reflects the emotive dissonance or disconnect that typically accompanies the implementer’s role.

Furthermore, it seemed that managers perceived their inability to withhold feelings from others as a clear norm violation. Several participants commented on their

ineptness in this area and the need to put forth more effort in correcting their behavior when interacting with other employees.

For example, a female manager named Abby*, stated, “My nonverbals are just awful. I wear my emotions right on my sleeve and I need to really work on that.... ‘cause like sometimes I can’t believe the stuff that comes out of my mouth and I don’t mean it to.” In reflecting upon his most recent emotive experiences, another participant, Bob*, similarly noted, “My problem is—lately I have been more vocal about things that I don’t like, my frustrations, and I’ve really been trying hard to quit doing that but sometimes it just slips out.”

Other comments made by participants suggested the situational appropriateness of certain emotional displays. That is, it is perfectly acceptable to express honest and deep felt emotions behind closed doors, yet not in more public arenas, such as in meetings or presentations, and certainly not in the presence of senior management or customers. As Bob indicated, “I have a difficult time. I am trying really hard not to vent my frustrations in front of employees. I don’t ever do that in front of customers.”

One manager, Leslie*, reflected on her experiences as a consultant for an organization undergoing change. She recalled having to advise a more demonstrative employee on how to manage her emotions more effectively during meetings. “[I told this individual] if you have a burning concern about something, hold it and know that you can talk to me about it afterwards and we will determine a way to get your concerns met.”

Another interviewee, Greg*, explained that his decision to suppress feelings about the change publicly was more a matter of professionalism and the need to neutralize rather than influence others’ feelings about the change:

I felt as a manager of a team who looked up to me and respected my opinion, I felt like I had a responsibility to present decisions in the best possible, truthful light. If I had personal opinions, reservations about a decision that was made and being passed down, a team meeting was not the time to voice those opinions because they are just that, they were opinions and they could be wrong....and I didn't want them to affect other people's ability to contribute to the change by being negative about a decision.

At the same time, when asked who they go to for support in dealing with their own emotions about the change, participants indicated that they had colleagues and friends to whom they could privately "vent." In some instances, these confidantes were external to the organization, but more often than not, managers would only have to travel two doors or two floors either direction to be able express their genuine frustrations and concerns in managing the change effort.

Honesty/Directness. Although managers stressed the need to suppress their own emotions, this norm was counterbalanced with the need to be honest and direct. As one respondent emphasized, "Be transparent." However, there was some distinction in the data in terms of whether honesty meant being forthcoming with information about the change or being transparent with one's own opinions and feelings. For instance, Helen commented on how being honest about the change helps her in managing the emotional states of others:

I'm always for the side of spilling our gut—always for that side of overcommunicating and telling everybody everything....You're gonna either deal with their frustrations and their anger now or you're gonna deal with it in a much

larger case later on, because the longer you wait to tell ‘em the truth, the worse their reactions are gonna get.

Another manager, Sally*, suggested that being honest and open with information helps to relieve the “pain” associated with change by stating, “When change is most painful is when associates, employees, are in the dark. I think even when it’s painful, if you know and you feel that people are being straightforward with you, you can deal with it.”

Still, others stressed the need to present an honest and realistic picture of the change by discussing both its positive and negative aspects. For example, Joe shared, “What I try to do is figure out what are the positives, what are the negatives....I don’t sugarcoat the negatives, but I also don’t dwell on them.” He then added:

You know, I’ll tell ‘em. I’ll say “you all, look, this is what we’re doing”..and that initial meeting, you know, spell out what we’re doing, why we are doing it.

There’s always negatives. I don’t want anybody to think that I’m (a) so stupid I didn’t seem ‘em or (b) trying to sugarcoat it and just ignore ‘em and maybe they’ll go away. So I just lay ‘em out there.

In addition to providing as much information as possible, honesty was further reflected in managers’ willingness to be forthright with their own opinions and feelings about the change. Few respondents acknowledged that they would openly vent their frustrations to their team, unless, as mentioned earlier, it was by mistake and, therefore, a behavior that required modification. However, some participants pointed to the history of their work group (i.e., how long they had been together) and to the amount of rapport and trust existing between them as justification for being more honest with their emotions. For instance, Sally stated, “I was comfortable enough with my relationship with my staff

that I could at least vent some of my frustrations of the unknown....We're very comfortable with discussing our concerns with each other."

Helen commented in a similar manner:

I had a real positive relationship with them. They would pretty much accept anything I told them as far as, and with good reason, because I really strive to be honest and direct and truthful with them. So they would pretty much accept anything I said.

In further analyzing the interviews, it became evident that there is somewhat of a dialectical tension with respect to how open versus how repressed or restrained managers feel they should be with their emotions. For example, even though some participants seem to clearly advocate the need to restrain themselves emotionally, these same individuals would often talk about the need for openness and, as demonstrated in the excerpts above, revealed situations in which they were more honest about their feelings with employees. Comments made both by Dave and Celeste*, respectively, reflect this particular tension:

You have to be negative sometimes—you can't always just be sunshine, especially not with smart and savvy people, but, at the same time, you need to let them know that you've got a job to do, you're aware that there are some frustrations and some problems but to have them look at you as the person to affect change in the other direction if it needs to happen (Dave).

You have to totally work at, you have to have this very fine line between being objective and apart from what's going on....We also have to convey a willingness to collaborate and partner. Its an odd dynamic because its like you have to be

empathetic and you have to listen to them, but, at the same time, when you step back, what they're doing a lot of times doesn't make sense (Celeste).

Respondents also mentioned specific turning points during change that compelled them to shift their existing emotional script for how to communicate with their employees. For one female manager, the turning point came when she realized that improvements were not being made to certain change processes. Clearly frustrated with the situation, her script of emotional restraint was replaced with a desire to be more direct and honest. For other implementers like Ron*, a turning point meant being able to discern from one situation to the next what is going to be the most productive emotional response. In the excerpt below, he explains the shift he made from being open and honest to more discerning with his feelings:

I think it really depends....Its always a dangerous situation....If I am feeling the same frustration, I'll definitely acknowledge it—but, at some point, and its just a gut feeling, it's counterproductive if you complain. Depending on what it is, sometimes, even if you agree, you just try diffuse it....You try to be very direct and say 'I know you don't like working with that person but that person's not going to go away and the project has to get done and so there's one solution.

This same sentiment was echoed by at least three other participants who talked about a point during change when the need for emotional restraint surpassed the desire for genuine emotional expression.

Yet, even though the above excerpt seems to indicate that turning points are individually defined—that is, the individual determines when he/she will make the shift in behavior—at least two of the managers' experiences suggest that a shift in emotional

expression is just as much a function of the overall culture. Greg described his organization as having a “disagree and commit” type culture where it was perfectly acceptable to express personal opinions and feelings during the early stages of change, but once the decision was made to execute, managers were expected to repress whatever previous feelings they had and “get on board” with the change effort. He explained:

Even if you disagree with a decision, you need to get on board with it because it’s been made and if you can’t get on board with the decision and support it when it’s been made, then you need to go somewhere else....During the debate phase of a project, you’re open to voice any concerns you want, but once the decision was made and that’s the direction we’re going, you need to support that decision or you need to go do something else.

Similarly, when talking about appropriate emotional behavior during planning meetings, one interviewee named Karl* had this to say about the type of emotional commitment that is expected of managers during a change effort. Incidentally, he also reflects on the degree of emotive management that is, at times, needed in order to make such a commitment:

When I go into a meeting with my peers or when I go into a meeting with my boss and I’m there with eight other people, we, in there, we argue like cats and dogs, whatever, knowing that it’s closed doors. We then agree what it is we’re going to do. Once we agree to what we’re going to do, we all have to get emotionally committed to that, and we have to internalize it in our own heads. We have to keep our mouths shut until we understand how we want to communicate that. We don’t come out of the meeting “that is the stupidest, freakin’ idea I’ve ever

heard”, even if we think it was, even if we said that during the meeting. Once the decision of the team is made, you live with it.

Empathy/Compassion. Despite the emotional restraint and suppression echoed by a number of managers, respondents also voiced their belief in expressing empathy and compassion for their staff. Interestingly, when asked about their approach in dealing with employees during change, many managers, at one point or another, referred to the proverbial “Golden Rule” as a guiding force. As Bob metaphorically explained, “I firmly believe that you ‘get more flies with honey than you do vinegar’....I just think people need to be treated like you want to be treated, even though you are their supervisor.” For other managers, expressing empathy meant providing continued emotional support for employees through the “ups and downs” of change.

For instance, Helen reflected, “I let ‘em talk, you know, and get kind of quasi-counselor on them and let them just go on and try to ask them the kind of questions that let them really get into it and, then, ask them what they want me to do to help them.”

Similarly, Sally talked about the need to be accessible for employees:

To me, at that point, it was I’ve got to keep my group together, we’ve got to keep functioning the way we are and just give them as much support and I think that’s part of it too....I mean, I got an open door policy of, you know, “you need to talk to me, come walk in” kind of thing.

Expressing empathy also meant going beyond simply addressing the professional fears and concerns. Karl, for example, expressed a strong desire to be emotionally invested in his employees’ personal lives as well. He stated, “I realize that I’m only able, legally, to worry about work performance, but if I don’t really care about people, you

know, what's going on in their lives, or their kids' college. If I don't care about that, then what good is working, you know?"

Still, for others, being empathic meant being open and willing to assume the perspective of another. This sense of otherness was clearly reflected throughout the interviews as participants talked about their myriad change experiences. As Celeste acknowledged, "You know when you get into a discussion with somebody, it's like you have to be willing to change your view to take theirs—you have to be open to that."

Another manager named Susan* also talked about the resistance she faced from one department when leading a particular change initiative. To avoid additional misunderstandings and tensions between workgroups, she sought to reach out to those who were most resistant by acknowledging their frustrations and seeking their perspective on the issue:

The communication department was the most resistant group—they wanted to do this. So, I went to the department head and I said 'look, I know that some people in your department feel that this is a communication issue and, in a way, that's very true, and it is...but, you know, it's everybody's issue so we're doing this stand alone group made up of a group from all of us and I'm wondering how you feel about this.

Interestingly, when asked about whether she ever felt disingenuous in trying to manage members' resistance to the change, this further likened her perspective-taking ability to that of a chameleon:

I'm very chameleon and I don't think that that's false because the chameleon in me has all of the things I'm showing and that is me, but to me, that's not

dishonest. I have a sense of high integrity and kind of “integratedness” about myself, so everybody that knows me knows that what you see is what you get. So, when I can speak your language, I think I’m being smart. Why would I make you conform to my style when I’m trying to communicate something to you? So, I never feel that.

Positive/Empowering. The expectation that managers will be positive agents for change was reflected in implementers’ discourse about “pep talks.” In some cases, delivering a pep talk meant simply being positive and encouraging employees, whether or not they, as implementers, really felt positive about the change. For example, when asked about what they might say to their team, Lisa reflected on her need to encourage and exhort others:

I believe in love—I do. I believe everybody needs to feel like you believe in them and like you can do it. I just constantly build them up and build them up and build them up and it’s not about me. I always say “You know what? The sales are up and I know it’s because of you girls, you girls are the front lines.” They feel very empowered.

She further noted:

I would say I tried to influence them to keep in mind that good always overcomes evil. That’s who I am too. If I let myself think about the negative then I’m going to be so bummed out. If I can just keep moving forward and just keep my eyes on what’s important and not worry about silly, silly middle school games.

Other managers reflected on the need to frame or put a positive spin on the change in order to motivate others. For instance, Sally stated, “I’ve got to put a positive

light on this. I was saying things like ‘well, you know guys, we’re a unique team, what we do, nobody else can do’ kind of thing and I think giving a pep talk helped.” Similarly, Joe noted, “I say ‘y’all, these are the things I see as good, these are things that I see as challenges, and the good far outweigh the challenges and let’s go do this and let’s have fun with it’.”

Although the majority of participants believed the change they were implementing was, theoretically, a positive and necessary step for the organization, they continued to have substantial reservations regarding the actual implementation. For example, some individuals were concerned about the proposed timeline of the change and the rapid speed with which change was being implemented, while others were clearly frustrated over the lack of resources and information being filtered down from the top. Yet, despite their fears and concerns, most managers felt it was important to stay focused and remain positive in front of employees. In such instances, delivering a pep talk meant deferring any negative talk about the change by focusing on the potential of the team and what they had accomplished in the past. As Dave noted:

You have to be able to give them some kind of philosophical approach and let them know that they’re good at what they’ve done before. For example, “You have a lot of experience with this other piece and you rocked on it and you have were exceptional on it. I don’t really think it’s all that different—you’re smart, you’ll be able to figure it out. You know what, I m here to help, the door’s always open.”

Helen echoed this same sentiment by adding, “I can certainly say things like ‘I don’t know how we’re going to do this—this is such a short turnaround time. I don’t know how

we're going to do it', but I will point to something we've done in the past and made it work." Moreover, when asked what he said to motivate others toward achieving the change objectives, Joe replied, "This is a high priority for the agency. If we are going to be successful in this agency, then we're going to do this well. We've never not done anything well and we're not going to start with this."

Detachment. Unlike emotional restraint, which requires that the expression of emotion be modified or altered in some way, detachment seems to suggest a need for implementers to separate themselves emotionally when leading others through change. Previous research points to the emotional detachment typically practiced by physicians, nurses, and other healthcare workers as way of maintaining a sense of professionalism amidst the reality of pain, death and suffering that accompanies their role (e.g., Smith & Kleinman, 1989). Although their work is not necessarily a life and death matter, the pain of change is undoubtedly significant enough that some implementers reinforced an "it's nothing personal, just business" approach to change. For these individuals, emotions are personal and, as such, should be checked at the door. As Connie suggested, "Things happen in life—I don't believe that you should make those things that happen in life play out at work....So I don't tend to believe being a highly emotional person in the office." She then discussed the need for detachment when she had to fire one of her employees:

Well, I tried not to be too emotional because that makes it personal. My goal was to say, "look, here are two of the things that we agreed were going to be happening, and they're not happening and lets' talk about what's the problem and what can we do to fix it."

When asked about the lessons he learned in implementing change, one manager, Cal* who had been acting as consultant, talked about the need to keep relationships functioning at the professional level and not to spend so much time investing in others on a personal level:

I need to look at things as less of a personal relationship between me and this other person but rather a relationship between me and my role and this other person's role in this thing.... And if there is a personal relationship there, that's a plus, but that is not a source or statement of my own personal value or participation or worth in this thing.

Sources for Acquiring Norms

In analyzing the different ways in which managers come to know and practice these emotional norms, five sources could be identified: Culture/Industry, Academic and Professional Training, Prior Experience, Intuition/Personal Values and Popular Press Literature.

Culture/Industry. Clearly, the culture and, to some extent, the different industries in which participants worked were influential in socializing them to the norms governing their roles as change implementers. In particular, there were strong leadership influences in at least three of the cases where the CEO or president defined the emotional climate of the organization by implicitly establishing and reinforcing certain emotional norms. For example, Leslie talked about how the president of her organization valued consensus above all else. She explained, "the way this organization works is through consensus....What I see being rewarded is 'let's do it the [company name] way—

slow and steady.” This culturally reinforced norm became problematic, however, when she felt compelled to change the way she managed her emotions in order to support this value.

Greg also discussed his experience about being part of a high consensus culture where opposition to change was not well received. When asked about how change was communicated initially, he reflected on the implicit cultural norms that more or less determined how managers should respond emotionally during meetings about the change:

[meetings] were framed as an open forum but it wasn’t 100% open. It was kind of like, you know, if you have any obvious questions or operational questions, go ahead and ask them but if you got something really inflammatory, your better off asking somebody about it later....The CEO, he wouldn’t be angry or anything, he would answer it, but you could tell looking around the room the feeling that that’s not the question to be asking. So it really was sort of unspoken.

In talking about the potential pitfalls associated with this type of culture, he further added, “Negative people didn’t last long and I guess in that culture there is a risk of having everybody be a yes man and not having a reasonable debate about things that need to be debated.”

Others made reference to the larger industry when talking about the emotional norms they put into practice. Celeste emphasized the role that industry plays in her remaining somewhat detached from the concerns of employees. She stated, “I think in HR, there is the expectation that HR will be objective, but also be sympathetic and empathic.” Likewise, Greg explained how the software industry shapes individuals’ perceptions and readiness for change:

Being in a software industry, you know, change is the only constant as they say and I think people in that industry are just generally, are more open to change than some industries because that is the nature of it....In this kind of environment, where innovation is key, innovation is change, new ways of doing things is the ‘rule’....I think in this industry, I don’t think change is feared as much as it is in maybe some other field.

Thus, from these comments, it appears as though the culture of the organization, as well as the industry in which it is housed, at the very least, implicitly defines expectations for what are appropriate feelings for a manager to experience as well as to express.

Academic and professional training. When asked about how they came to approach change the way that they did, and how they learned to be emotionally responsive to their employees during that process, some participants reflected on the previous training, or lack thereof, they had received. Several of the respondents earned graduate degrees and, as such, credited different theories and personal mentors for having impacted their ability to manage emotions during the change process. For example, when asked how she deals with employees who are struggling with the change, Helen referred to her experiences in graduate school, “Most of the time, it’s not conscious....But so much of what I’ve read and learned, I kind of digested and so I think about it.”

At least three participants who worked in HR talked about the influence that the late Oscar Mink had on their professional lives, while others mentioned personal mentors or colleagues who introduced them to new ways of managing change. Cal talked about a colleague of his who introduced him to *The Concerns Based Adoption Model* (CBAM; Hall & Hord, 2001)—a model designed to assess the sequence or stages of concerns that

individuals face when confronted with change. When he and his partner were charged with training and developing a team of supervisors responsible for managing and implementing change, they used CBAM to create dialogue about the change and to aid implementers in addressing their own concerns about change before addressing the concerns of others.

Still, others made reference to the professional training they received from their respective organizations or other external sources. Training for these individuals primarily consisted of having a personal coach, working with outside consultants, observing knowledge management teams, or participating in outside conferences and certification programs. Lisa even credited her ability to manage and lead others to her involvement in the local Junior League. And, yet, even with the number of opportunities afforded to members to improve their emotion management skills, there is clearly a lack of formalized training on the part of many organizations today, as evidenced by the comments made by Leslie and Bob:

There is a lack of communication skills training. How do you say “I’m concerned about this” or “this worries me” or “I’m afraid”, because, you know, “emotions are not acceptable in the workplace”—so if they’re not acceptable, you can’t talk about them (Leslie).

I had people comin’ to me with questions about what they should do in certain situations and my response invariably is, “you do what you think is right. If it’s not right, they’re going to let you know”.... Sometimes, I’m really not sure that’s what I should be doing (Bob).

Prior experience. Another indicator pointing to the lack of professional or formal training offered to implementers was the extent to which respondents relied on their previous experiences and the leadership of others to guide their emotive behaviors. As Connie suggested:

It's all about the people that have managed you through your career and watching them....It's experience, I think, more than anything else because you make mistakes early on. Some people, if you give them a lot of ground to complain, that's all they'll do. You learn how to diffuse it or how to handle it or how to counsel.

For many individuals, experience was, by far, the best teacher and, for most, a good lesson in what NOT to do when it came their turn to lead others through change. Bob, for instance, reflected on how a lack of positive feedback over the years motivated him to become a different manager, "I've never, not one time, been told I was doing a good job in 23 years. I want to treat people like I want to be treated and, so, if someone does a good job, I tell 'em." Similarly, Lisa reflected, "You know, once you get unloaded on by people with problems that aren't yours that become yours, you know I thought 'I never want to do this to anybody'. Because I am having a bad day doesn't mean you need to also."

Dave poignantly talked about how experience shaped the way he currently manages and "spins" certain aspects of change for his employees:

At this time, I really felt that I was not able to completely truthful or honest with the reps or the people that I worked with because I had to twist things somewhat so that it didn't come out as flat or as harsh as it was....And I learned from that

time, really kind of how to do that a little better—how to dance around some of the issues without being “found out”, for instance, and to put a positive spin on it.

Intuition/Personal values. In talking about their implementation experiences, managers further emphasized their reliance on “gut instincts” and intuition. For the majority of respondents in this category, they were not given formal, clear instruction on how to deal with members’ emotional responses to change, including their own. As such, their emotive behaviors were guided simply by what felt natural to them.

Bob explained:

I felt like I needed to go meet with people and kind of talk to ‘em because the other one was a successful, the last one[company] we combined with was a successful organization too....So I felt like it was necessary to have to go out, but nobody told me to do that.

When asked how she came to learn certain emotive behaviors, Sally further remarked, “To me, it’s very intuitive—essentially honest and open communication. I guess that’s part trial and error but I guess part of it just to me, you know, its kind of like you know, treat them like I’d like to be treated.”

The reference made to the “golden rule” in this last example is particularly indicative of how individuals’ personal values can largely define their sense for what is appropriate emotional behavior in managing change. At least three of the respondents directly acknowledged the role that religious faith and family values had on their emotional responses to change.

For example, when asked how he deals with the challenges of change, Joe replied,

“I’ve got a real laid back approach to it. A lot of that comes from religious faith, a lot of it comes from family. So, I don’t get worked up over those things.”

Similarly, Lisa talked about childhood influences as a possible reason for why her management style differs from the style of her superiors. She explained, “I really think my underpinnings are different. You know, I think I grew up in a very gentle way, and I think that makes a big difference, and I don’t think my management did.”

Popular press literature. Surprisingly, many participants did not, or, in some cases, could not, recall specific literature that helped them in learning how to manage change. Given the extensive amount of popular press books dealing with change management that are marketed and consumed each year, it would seem that their influence would have been more widely evidenced in this case, even with a fairly small, select sample. According to Connie, the cost in time and productivity it takes her to read practitioner-oriented literature far exceeds the benefits, at least in the short term. Nevertheless, a few managers referenced the work of well-known business gurus, such as Peter Drucker and Peter Senge, while others discussed the import of trade journals, business magazines (e.g., Fortune) and literature specific to their area of change.

For example, because she did not know much about subject, Susan talked about having to immerse herself in the knowledge management literature. Although doing so certainly enhanced her ability to implement change in this area, she further acknowledged that these books did not focus on how to deal with the emotional issues of change. Like so many of the respondents in this case, she relied heavily on past experience and intuition to guide her emotive behaviors.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was (a) to examine the different factors which would lead implementers to manage their emotional labor in different ways and (b) to identify the different norms characterizing implementers' emotive behaviors as well as the means by which they are socialized to those norms. Results from this study generated several interesting findings regarding members' experience of emotional labor as well as the influence of key predictors on the performance of emotional labor.

First, a factor analysis of the emotional labor construct revealed two factors similar to those generated by Kruml and Geddes (2000b). However, interpretation of the initial factor structures differed somewhat. Factor analysis conducted by Kruml and Geddes revealed a two-dimensional construct defined by emotive dissonance and emotive effort. Yet, when analyzing and interpreting those factors in this study, it would appear that both the faking and feeling associated with these dimensions require effort. The loading of emotional labor items on a single factor in the initial analysis and the clear delineation between surface and deep acting on a second factor analysis would suggest that emotional labor might very well be a unidimensional construct which captures the different emotive effort required for actively managing emotional displays, whether that be through surface acting or deep acting. Again, effort is required for any type of performance. It may take the same amount of effort to fake and express certain emotions as it does to genuinely feel them. What further defines or differentiates the experience or performance of emotional labor for individuals then is not necessarily the degree of

effort, but perhaps the degree of emotional alignment ultimately achieved through the effort.

In that same vein, the mean for both deep and surface acting was not exceedingly high as one might expect with a position that ostensibly requires a great deal of emotion management. Although these findings may point to a larger conceptualization and measurement issue, they also suggest that implementers, unlike service providers, may be less inclined to act and more likely to engage in passive deep acting behaviors in which true emotions are already aligned with what is expected.

One possible explanation for this may be the context in which emotional labor is performed. Given the low to moderate emotional labor means that were reported, it might be that there is less perceived acting going on when the emotional labor exists from interactions that take place within the organization as opposed to interactions with others outside the organization. Perhaps the minimal effort to either fake or feel in this case is due to the length or history of the relationship itself. That is, the more people work together on a daily basis, the more emotionally transparent they become.

This argument runs counter to Morris and Feldman's (1996, 1997) conclusion that the longer the duration of the interaction with external stakeholders (e.g., customers/clients) the more emotional labor that is required. However, in this case, the focus is on internal (e.g., employees) and not external stakeholders. It would make little sense for a manager, who most likely has frequent and extended interactions with his/her employees, to put forth anything other than a quasi-genuine display of emotion for the simple fact that their employees would be able to recognize, and most likely resent, an attempt at duplicity. Data from the interviews further support this conclusion in that

managers often attributed their ability to be more genuinely expressive or suppressive to such factors as their relational history with team members. These findings also point to the socially constructed nature of emotions and particularly managed emotions—that is, how we choose to respond emotionally to certain people and events is in, large part, governed by our ongoing interactions and relationships with one another.

Another possible explanation for these relatively low means is that the type of emotional labor experienced between implementers and their teams is not the same form of labor that typically characterizes service encounters. In analyzing the interviews, it became increasingly evident that organizations rarely mandate anything when it comes to managing the emotionality of change. In this case, there was no external customer and the service being provided had more to do with making team members feel comfortable with change than making a profit or generating a loyal consumer base. In this case, the pressure to conform to certain norms or display rules most often came from *within* the implementer, either through their existing value system or through past experience. This is similar to what Tolich (1993) defines as autonomous emotional labor in which individuals conform to their own standards of appropriate emotional behavior rather than those of the organization. It may be that because implementers' emotional displays were more often self-imposed, there was a tendency to want to view those behaviors as genuine and less “performative.”

Research further points to the influence that individual variables such as gender, age, experience and even empathy have on the performance of emotional labor (Kruml & Geddes, 2000b). However, simple bivariate correlations between predictor and criterion variables in this case indicated no significant relationship between age, gender, or

empathy (i.e., empathic concern or emotional contagion) and the different acting types. Such discrepancies could, once again, be a matter of the sample population. Individuals represented in this study are all of a particular level or perceived status within the organization. Although research has shown such factors as gender (Timmers, Fischer, & Manstead, 1998) and empathy (Kruml & Geddes, 2000b) to be influential in the regulation and management of emotions, findings from this study suggest that the emotional expressions of mid- to upper-level management are less a function of these factors and more a function of members' identification with their dual role as manager-implementer. Indeed, implementers reported in the questionnaire moderate to strong levels of identification with their role and, as such, were more inclined to align whatever emotions they were feeling internally with those they were expected to express publicly. This finding both supports and extends previous research which suggests that job involvement, or the degree to which one is psychologically attached to their work (i.e., role identity), is more closely associated with the effort individuals put forth to deep act (Kruml & Geddes, 2000b). However, unlike these findings which cast job involvement as an outcome of deep acting, the current study found role identity to be a positive antecedent for deep acting, suggesting, once again, the complexities associated with the performance of emotional labor.

Moreover, our notion of identification can and should be extended to include the influence that organizational identification, not just role identification, has on the performance of emotional labor. For example, the "disagree-commit" culture emphasized within the interviews demonstrates that buying into the bigger picture or mission of the organization may help to mitigate the load of emotional labor. By strongly identifying

with the principles and practices governing the organization, managers were able to reconcile and align their own feelings or concerns about the change with organizational expectations.

Self-monitoring also proved to be a significant predictor of managers' inclination to deep act and genuinely feel emotions they were expected to express as agents for change. Interestingly, however, the relationship between the two was negative, suggesting that high self-monitors may not perceive themselves as acting at all when adapting their emotional behaviors to others. Although there has been some question as to the impact of self-monitoring on emotional labor, these findings further support Abraham's (1999) arguments that self-monitoring may, in fact, be one way to bring genuine emotions in line with expected emotions (i.e. passive deep acting) and achieve a sense of emotional balance.

Perhaps most surprising was the negligible impact that certain contextual variables had on the different acting types. One obvious limitation of the quantitative analysis in this study was that it only investigated two event-specific variables—routineness of change and individuals' perceived stakes in the change. Although this study offers theoretical reasons for why these factors, in particular, would impact the performance of emotional labor, they are by no means exhaustive. Interestingly, the amount of time that was spent managing change was significantly predictive of deep acting. Although this relationship was not posited a priori, it does suggest that it is the degree of involvement individuals have in actually managing the change, and not necessarily the overall frequency or routineness of change within the organization, that determines how they respond emotionally to the event. In other words, how often

managers are faced with change is not as revealing as how much they perceive themselves being directly involved and invested in the process.

Moreover, interview data revealed that prior experience in managing change also influenced managers' desire and ability to express or suppress certain emotions. Those who had extensive experience in managing change were seemingly more apt to balance spontaneously felt emotions with the strategically expressed emotions. Likewise, several managers made reference to different "turning points" over the course of a change effort that compelled them to shift their emotive scripts. These shifts were typically accompanied by a shift in the emotional climate surrounding the change and what the existing perceptions of the change were at that particular moment. Such findings lend additional credence to social-psychodynamic theories of emotion which advance the belief that individuals' emotional behaviors are shaped by their past experiences as well as through their interactions and responses to the emotional expressions of others.

Finally, this study sheds light on the relationship between communication and implementers' performance of emotional labor. Previous research (Kruml & Geddes, 2000b; Morris & Feldman, 1996,1997) points to the influence that formal training and explicit communication of display rules have on members' perceived latitude to express emotion. However, this study proposed that the more prevalent and widely practiced emotive norms are, regardless of whether they are conveyed through formal or informal means, the less likely members are to perceive autonomy and latitude in their emotional expressions and the more likely they are to surface act. Indeed, the quantitative data suggests that the more norms were understood and enacted, the more inclined implementers were to conform to these rules through faking. Contrary to previous

findings in this area (see Kruml & Geddes, 2000b; Morris & Feldman, 1997), the fact that managers felt more compelled to fake versus put forth more genuine expressions of emotions would indicate that they actually perceived less control over how they expressed their emotions.

Data from both the questionnaires and interviews further revealed the potential impact of peer networks on the communication and reinforcement of emotive norms surrounding change. For example, perceived congruency of emotive norms was found to be significantly correlated with surface acting and approached significance in its ability to predict deep acting. That is, the more individuals perceived congruence, the more motivated they were to put forth effort to conform to display rules in a way that was consistent with others. The effort to establish or maintain certain emotive norms based on the actions of others in this case provides additional support for co-orientation theories and more directly signals the potential impact that communication among equal status peers has on the performance of emotional labor.

The role of peer networks was further evidenced during the interviews as managers talked about who they go to in helping them understand and make sense of their own feelings about the change. At least one interviewee acknowledged the impact that talking to other managers had on his overall perceptions of the change effort and, ultimately, his emotive responses towards employees. In some cases, ruminating about emotions with others can lead individuals to construct a shared view of reality that is ultimately negative and dismal at best. However, in talking with their peers about their frustrations surrounding the change, managers ostensibly felt more positive rather than negative about their role in the change process. Thus, peer networks served as a way for

implementers to seek constructive emotional support from those in similar positions and to express genuine feelings about the change.

Much of the popular press literature on managing change further emphasizes the need for leaders to communicate much and often so that rumor mills, and the informal networks that give birth to them, are not overly activated. Likewise, research conducted by Lewis et al. (2003) examining the communicative approaches taken by change implementers to communicate with various stakeholder groups discovered that, indeed, implementers valued earlier and more frequent communication with internal stakeholders (e.g., employees) than external stakeholders. Even though implementers in this study certainly voiced the same desire, they were unable to actually put those principles into practice and effectively deal with others' emotions due to inadequate resources. For example, a number of interviewees stated that what often precluded them from being emotionally open and honest with their employees was simply a lack of information and updates from senior management. Subsequently, it was this lack of information about the change that impaired managers' ability to effectively manage the meaning of the change for their employees.

Contributions

In lieu of the findings discussed above, there are a number of contributions that the present study makes to both the emotion and communication literatures.

Communication scholars, for instance, have become increasingly focused on the topic of emotional labor and have offered much in the way of richly textured data describing the emotional labor of others (e.g., Miller, 2002; Schuler & Sypher, 2000; Tracy, 2000).

However, the majority of these studies are largely qualitative in nature and, as such, do

not seek to explore the predictive, or even causal, relationships that can also add to our existing theoretical framework of emotional labor. Fortunately, calls have been made that promote the need for more quantitative data in this area (Adelmann, 1995). In an attempt to meet this need, the present study marks one of few attempts within the communication literature to examine the predictive value of factors on individuals' performance of emotional labor and their attempt to conform to display rules.

Likewise, emotional research in the management and psychology arena has revealed a number of job and individual characteristics related to emotional labor, including job autonomy (Abraham, 1998; Morris & Feldman, 1997), task routineness (Morris & Feldman, 1997) self-monitoring (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1989; Zerbe, 2000), gender (Wharton & Erickson, 1993), and emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1998). Yet, very few studies have attempted to emphasize different communicative and contextual factors impacting the performance of emotional labor. The very notion of emotion as a socially-constructed reality suggests the need for organizational scholars to examine how communication and environment shapes emotional responses to others and to workplace events. Results from this study undoubtedly help to address this gap within the larger organizational discipline by illustrating the predictive value of certain communication-based practices, such as the degree to which emotive norms are communicated and practiced, and by identifying the different communicative strategies that ultimately shape and define those norms.

Furthermore, the examination of different individual, contextual and communicative factors in this study lead us to both support as well as question theories that currently inform emotional labor research. For example, research has shown self-

monitoring to be positively associated with emotional dissonance such that high self-monitors are more likely to be adversely affected by emotional dissonance (Abraham, 1999) than low self-monitors. Quantitative results from this study also demonstrated a significant relationship between self-monitoring and emotional labor. However, in this case, self-monitoring was found to be negatively related to deep acting. The fact that high self-monitors were less likely to engage in either acting type calls into question the assumption that high self-monitors, given their adaptive, transient nature, would be more motivated to conform to emotive norms and rules. On the contrary, high self-monitors in this case felt less of a need to act and align their internal feelings with publicly managed expressions of emotions. Perhaps to the high self-monitor, the facades of conformity identified by Hewlin (2003) are not facades after all, but merely extensions of oneself.

Additionally, most studies have only theorized about the relationship between role identification and emotional labor. One exception to this is Miller's (2002) account of the Texas A&M bonfire tragedy where she addresses the unique impact that identification had on both students' and teachers' emotional responses. Similarly, Kruml and Geddes (2000a) discovered that job involvement (i.e., attachment or identification to one's role) was positively associated with members' effort to try and feel versus fake the expected emotions. The significant relationship found between role identification and deep acting in this study lends additional support for these findings by suggesting that the more individuals internalize and identify with their role, the less likely they are to experience the dissonance that stems from faking a desired set of emotions.

For example, even though managers in this case reported that they did not engage in much surface acting, they talked openly in the interviews about the need "to fake it"

when leading others through a change effort. This apparent disparity within the data may be due, in large part, to managers' identification with their implementation role. That is, the more implementers identified with their role and responsibilities, the more they were able to fake their emotions in good faith, and, thus, the less they perceived themselves as having to really "perform" their emotions. A number of managers indicated how much they believed in and enjoyed their work, despite the fact that they may have had to frequently manage and suppress their own emotions. For the majority of interview respondents, what seemed to be most important was getting the job done right and making the change successful—both of which suggest a clear commitment to, and identification with, their roles as implementers.

Results from this study also contribute to theory regarding the link between identification and authenticity. For example, one interviewee commented that, although she generally feels inauthentic in her job, she does what she is required to do and, in doing so, feels very authentic. Indeed, the experience described by this participant reflects a type of paradox in which individuals who strongly identify with their role, or specific aspects of the role (e.g., be positive, supportive), view even inauthentic displays of emotion as a means by which to bring authenticity to their work, and, ultimately, to themselves (Ashforth & Tomiuk, 2000). Ashforth and Tomiuk equate this level of identification with a sense of deep authenticity. That is, for those who highly identify with what they do, being true to the emotive norms of the job, regardless of whether such emotions are genuinely felt, means being true and authentic to the self.

Results from this study also establish a need for research to extend its conceptualization of emotional labor to include situations in which the management of

emotions is internally, rather than externally, driven. Tolich (1993) argued that not all emotional labor is alienating or performed under the control of the organization. He then defined autonomous emotional labor to represent those instances where employees manage their emotions and adhere to a specific set of emotive norms because they believe those norms are necessary and not because the organization mandates them to do so. In such instances, the display of emotions continues to provide an exchange value within the organization, but the locus of control in regulating those emotions lies within the individual and not the organization. The autonomy with which change implementers seemed to perform their emotional labor in this case supports theory advocating the different forms of emotion management (see Callahan & McCollum, 2002) and further contributes to the literature by identifying how emotional labor might serve to function outside the traditional service context.

Indeed, much of the existing theoretical framework for emotional labor to date is based on empirical research conducted within a variety of service contexts in which employees are often required to manage genuinely felt emotions in order to meet the needs and expectations of the client. In exchange for these pleasantries, the customer then patrons the organization. However, what about interactions that take place within the organization and among coworkers? Considering the autonomous emotional labor reflected upon by interviewees in this case, and the fact that there were few correlations between the performance of emotional labor and the majority of the proposed predictors, the present study makes a case for the contextualization of emotional labor—that is, emotional labor may very well “look” and function differently depending on the context

in which it is performed. Certainly studies in the past have more or less implicated this through their findings.

For example, Schuler and Sypher (2000) discovered that 911 dispatchers actually enjoyed and sought out opportunities to engage in emotional labor. In this context, emotional labor served as a form of comic relief for dispatchers and a means by which employees could satisfy their altruistic desires to help others in need. Contrast these findings with Hochschild's (1983) stories of flight attendants who, given the specific context and nature of their work, reflected on the frustrations and stress accompanying their emotional labor. The contextual aspect of emotional labor as evidenced here is all the more reason why researchers need to examine emotion management practices across a variety of industries, professions and organizational contexts. In viewing organizational change as an affective event or context, this study not only addresses this call but also represents one of few attempts to extend the experience of emotional labor to include managed interactions that take place between and among employees.

In addition to its focus on emotion management, this research makes several contributions to existing change theory, particularly with respect to how change is communicated. Researchers have recently begun to devote more attention to understanding how communication influences the change process (Barrett et al., 1995; Fairhurst, 1993; Fairhurst et al., 1995; Lewis, 1999; Lewis et al., 2001; Zorn et al., 2000). Specifically, research has identified a number of communicative strategies used by leaders and implementers to build solidarity for change (Lewis et al., 2001, 2003) and to create a set of shared meanings surrounding a particular change initiative (Fairhurst). Likewise, the qualitative findings generated here serve as additional evidence for how

leaders can frame messages in a way that makes planned change more palatable for employees.

In an effort to understand innovation processes, Kanter (2000) further outlines specific skills sets necessary for change leaders looking to promote a culture of change and innovation, including the ability to communicate a compelling aspiration for change and to build coalitions of people that will serve to support innovation within the organization. Although these two aspects are certainly necessary and are imbued with emotional overtones, such advice is largely prescriptive and offers little in the way of understanding how emotion, specifically, can and should be managed in bringing these skills to fruition. Fortunately, the qualitative findings from this study add another dimension to these and other extant theories related to change communication by emphasizing specific emotive behaviors underlying leaders' efforts to build support for change.

Not only does this study attempt to illuminate change as an emotional process, its findings portray the role of the change implementer as an inherently emotional one. Consistent with previous research that deals with enactment of generalized display rules (e.g., Kramer & Hess, 2002; Zorn, 2002), the present study suggests that, when faced with few explicit rules, implementers will most often draw upon informal norms, intuition and heuristics in managing the ambivalence and uncertainty of change. Fortunately, other scholars are becomingly increasingly focused on the emotionality of change and particularly the emotions governing managers who lead the process. For example, Frost' research (2003) dealing with pain and compassion in the workplace underscores the type of emotional behaviors that managers, as "toxin handlers" within the

organization, need to put forth in managing employees' personal and professional pain. Other research by Turnbull (1999, 2002) examines managers' planned and unplanned emotional reactions to the implementation of a corporate change program as well as the implications that different feeling rules have on managers' emotions during the change process.

Yet, even with this growing interest in emotions and change, there remains little empirical evidence that would speak to the emotionality of change or the emotion work governing the change agent's role. With the exception of Turnbull (1999), this study is one of the first to apply principles of emotional labor to the work of middle and upper level managers and, specifically, to that of change implementers. In light of some of the findings presented here, change scholars might view emotional labor as an alternative lens with which to examine the complexities surrounding organizational change processes.

Finally, this study contributes to the literature by replicating and testing existing quantitative measures of emotional labor. As previously stated, more quantitative assessments of emotional labor are needed in order to compare the relative weight of different factors on various emotional behaviors and to provide more statistical evidence for the number of theoretical and empirical discoveries that currently inform emotional labor research. Yet, one challenge in establishing more quantitative assessments of emotion has been the relatively low reliability of the items used to measure certain dimensions of emotional labor. Both exploratory factor analysis and reliability testing in this case revealed an internally consistent and reliable measure of emotional labor. However, factor analyses also revealed a different factorial structure of emotional labor

than has been generated in the past (see Kruml & Geddes, 2000b). Given the current conceptual state of the emotional management literature, such differences in our understanding and interpretation of emotional labor certainly give us cause to think and reassess how we should be defining and measuring it.

Limitations

Although this study certainly contributes to our understanding of emotional labor, there are some potential limitations worth noting. The first involves the self-report nature of the data and the potential for common method variance. Method variance is an “artifact of the measurement that has been known to bias results when relations are explored among constructs measured by the same method” (Spector, p. 438, 1987). In this case, the majority of hypothesized relationships were all assessed using self-report data from a single questionnaire. Miller (2001) contends that the use of self-reports are not necessarily problematic as long as perceptions are inherent to the particular phenomenon under investigation. In the case of emotional labor, researchers have argued that self-report methods are perhaps the only way to adequately assess how people manage such subjective experiences (Averill, 1982; Wallbott & Scherer, 1989). Moreover, Erickson and Ritter (2001) claim that “the use of such methods will bring surveys more closely into line with the conceptual notion of emotional labor [as the] *management of feeling* in a paid work context” (p. 151), rather than actual feelings which are often more difficult to assess or observe.

Research also suggests that method variance may be less of a biasing problem when testing perceptual constructs than first believed (Spector, 1987). Although individuals’ perceptions are necessary and often more consequential than their actual

behavior (Fairhurst, Jordan & Neuwirth, 1997), future studies should continue to employ different methodologies to examine how people use communication in managing their emotions.

Second, given the scope of this project, it was not possible to assess all potential antecedents of emotional labor. The individual-based factors in this case were chosen based on the role they played in previous studies dealing with emotional labor, whereas the communicative and contextual factors were largely determined by the impact that they were believed to have on members' experience of emotions during the change process. Yet, even though these variables were purposefully selected, there ceased to be much direct correlation between these factors and emotional labor. The lack of direct relationships in this case may have any number of explanations. First, it could be that these relationships are, in fact, spurious because the phenomenon under investigation here may represent a form of emotion management that is aligned, but not necessarily synonymous, with emotional labor as it is more traditionally defined. A second explanation for the lack of direct relationships is that the individual, contextual, and communicative predictors investigated here are but a small piece in what is ultimately a larger, more intricate puzzle of emotional labor. A more comprehensive model is needed that takes into consideration a greater number of potential interacting relationships and their association with both antecedents and outcome variables.

Third, there was a 10-15% return rate of uncompleted questionnaires. Although this is not completely unexpected given the nature of field research, such attrition is worth noting and exploring. In this particular case, the amount of uncompleted questionnaires is most likely a result of response fatigue. When informally asked how

long it took to complete the questionnaire, some participants indicated that they were able to finish within 20-25 minutes, while others said that it took 45 minutes or more to address the questions. Upon looking at the raw data, there was also a noticeable decline in responses midway through the questionnaire just prior to and, in some cases, directly after the section dealing with emotions at work. Although items that were awkwardly worded on the pretest were either eliminated or modified, participants may have had a challenging time in answering questions about their emotions at work.

A final limitation of this study was the overall size of the sample (N=141) and, thus, the capacity for the regression analyses to detect any statistically significant differences. Although tests of sampling adequacy clearly indicated the current data was suitable for analyses, a larger sample would help to enhance the generalizability and interpretation of the findings.

Future Studies

In addition to its contributions, the present study offers several directions for the future research. First, given the autonomous nature with which implementers seem to manage their emotional labor, future studies should assess whether the form of emotion management that individuals use (e.g., autonomous emotional labor, indirect emotional labor, emotional labor; Callahan & McCollum, 2002) is influenced by their role or status within the organization. Callahan and McCollum emphasize the role of leadership development in shaping different emotion management practices. Specifically, they contend that programs designed to develop transformational leaders increase self-awareness and help individuals become more emotionally competent and better able to self-regulate their own emotions. However, it is unlikely that such programs or

interventions would even be made available to the lower ranks of the organization. Rather, it seems that the higher up the organizational ladder individuals go, and the fewer reporting mechanisms that are in place at a particular level, the more autonomous and self-regulated members can be in their work and in how they express certain emotions. Future research would be well served to examine if role, and any related training for that role, influences the amount of control that members perceive they have in expressing genuine emotions. Given that autonomy, or a lack thereof, can impact the type of consequences (i.e., negative vs. positive work related outcomes; Wharton, 1999) associated with the performance of emotional labor, organizations may want to do more to empower employees in their emotion management efforts, regardless of their position or status within the organization.

On that note, researchers should also assess the different outcomes or consequences that result when the pressure to conform to display rules is internally versus externally controlled. For example, when emotional labor is autonomously performed, do managers perceive more or less job dissatisfaction and burnout than when the pressure to conform stems from formal organizational rules and scripts? Wharton (1999) found that jobs requiring emotional labor and those not requiring emotional labor did not differ much with respect to burnout. Rather, what led to greater amounts of burnout among employees were the number of hours worked as well as a perceived lack of control over current circumstances. If a lack of control or autonomy does, in fact, lead to more burnout, then it seems reasonable to argue that by engaging in autonomous emotional labor, managers might be able to avoid some of the more negative consequences associated with traditional forms of emotional labor. Future research would

benefit by exploring these alternative forms of emotional labor and their ability to account for differences among individuals' experience of emotional labor.

Based on the results of this study, researchers are further encouraged to address the importance of identification, both role and organizational, on the performance of emotional labor and how this, in turn, might be influenced by supervisory levels. Given that the majority of respondents in this case represented middle management, comparisons across supervisory levels could not be made. However, previous research has noted the positive relationship between organizational role and work unit commitment (Fairhurst et al., 1997). That is, the higher one ascends the organizational hierarchy, the more invested they are with their work, the more committed and identified they become to one or more targets within the organization (e.g., work group, role/profession, organization). In considering the different managerial levels within the organization, we could extend this area of research by addressing the extent to which managerial level (e.g., senior, middle, lower level) influences the degree of identification to either the role and/or the organization.

In terms of change implementation, researchers might also assess whether managers' strength of identification further influences their commitment to and support for the change effort. It makes sense to reason that the more identified managers are to their role as implementer and to the organization, the more their beliefs about what is good and appropriate emotional behavior will be consistent with those of the organization. If that is the case, then, naturally, the more identified individuals are, the more likely they will be committed to and supportive of the change effort. Given that

middle managers are in the position to “sell” the change, their level of identification and support for the change should be of particular interest to organizational leaders.

Of course, managers at all levels of the organization are likely to be charged with implementation responsibilities. The fact that middle managers are the most widely acknowledged when it comes to leading change efforts should not preclude scholars from analyzing emotive behaviors at all levels within the organization. Quite the contrary, the structural proximity of middle managers, senior executives and first-line supervisors to the front lines of change may very well reveal differences in the extent to which managers seek to conform to emotional norms and display rules associated with implementation. Thus, another fruitful area of research would be to assess the extent to which managerial level determines both the type of emotive norms that are established during change and the extent to which those norms are practiced and reinforced.

It may be that managers on the shop floor can be more candid and open with their emotions about change because they do not have to directly report to those closest to the top. Conversely, because of their particular position within the reporting hierarchy, middle managers may feel more pressure to conform to the emotive expectations of senior level employees. Thus, some of the questions that might be addressed as part of this agenda include: What are the specific emotions that are both felt and displayed by leaders at various levels in the organization? Do those emotions differ and why? Are there significant differences in the amount of pressure managers feel at these different levels to conform to emotive norms or are more authentic expression of emotions regarding the change encouraged?

The fact that the majority of emotive norms described in this study were either inherent to the manager or were developed through past experience further points to the informal socialization that managers experience in preparing for their roles as implementers. Socialization efforts are designed to motivate individuals towards achieving the specific goals and objectives of the organization. With that in mind, it would be useful to examine how socialization practices of those responsible for implementing change subsequently influence specific change outcomes. For example, does the level of formality with which emotive norms are learned and then reinforced impact the overall success of the implementation as well as employees' responsiveness and reception to the change? Perhaps if the relationship between socialization efforts and change outcomes were better understood and more empirically defined, senior leaders within the organization would be more inclined to make the management and communication of emotions a core part of the literature, training, and conversations surrounding a particular change effort.

Socialization practices aside, future studies would be well served to examine the influence that a variety of communication practices have on the management of emotions, including the role that peer support networks play in governing members' emotive behaviors. Findings revealed here, indeed, point to the influence that peers had on implementers' perceptions of the change as well as on their ability to cope with the stress and frustration surrounding a change effort. However, what about instances where supportive communication proves to be dysfunctional?

It would be shortsighted to assume that all supportive communication is inherently good and always results in a set of desired outcomes. Scholars argue that seeking out

others to help us manage our emotions may not always buffer feelings of stress or dissonance (Planalp, 1999). Research has shown that individuals who receive and enact more support also report higher levels of stress (Barrera, 1981; Cohen & Hoberman, 1983; Politser, 1980). Individuals may feel as though they are creating unfavorable impressions by asking others for support and/or that they are threatening their own identity by being vulnerable and dependent on others (DePaulo, 1982; Silver & Wortman, 1980; Willis, 1983). Even when members attempt to be supportive of another, they may, in fact, communicate messages that cause more harm than good, especially if the support was not actively sought out by the receiver. Unsolicited advice from a fellow colleague, for example, can be perceived as helpful and supportive or it can be seen as intrusive or “butting in” (Goldsmith & Fitch, 1997). Other research examining contagion effects illustrate both the positive and negative impact that emotions can have on fellow team members (e.g., Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995). Especially in instances of organization change, where displaced emotions can stifle creativity and innovation, more work needs to be done to examine the constructive and possibly destructive influence that peer support networks have on employees’ overall well-being.

Moreover, in considering the emotional contagion that can be experienced by different work groups, it would be interesting to note the extent to which such contagion effects further influence and shape the emotive scripts of change leaders. As was evidenced in this study, implementers routinely feel the need to suppress any negative emotions they may have about the change in hopes of influencing their employees to feel more comfortable and positive about the change. However, what about instances in which managers feel genuine excitement for the change, yet are compelled to suppress their

enthusiasm because of the negative or perhaps despondent climate that surrounds them? Rather than risk appearing insensitive and indifferent to what may be the legitimate concerns and fears of others, implementers in this case may feel pressured to abandon their emotive script of “be positive” in order to gain the liking, trust, and support from others that will be needed in building solidarity for change in the future.

As communication researchers, we also need to be building upon previous research that addresses the communicative strategies leaders employ in shaping and managing the meaning of organizational events (Bartunek, 1988; Fairhurst, 1993; Fairhurst et al., 1997; Fairhurst, Cooren, & Cahill, 2002). In terms of emotion and communication, there are a number of organizational contexts, including organizational change, in which scholars should examine the meaning and impact of emotive messages. Other affective events worth exploring in the literature would be the giving and receiving of feedback through daily, monthly or even yearly performance appraisals, employment interviews, extended training sessions and seminars, and even less conspicuous situations, such as the company picnic or awards dinner.

In keeping with Weiss and Cropanzano’s (1996) theory of affective events, research would also benefit by examining the emotive communication surrounding more mundane or routine affective events that take place within the organization, such as weekly meetings and daily progress updates among peers and between superiors and subordinates. Regardless of which context, however, the key will be to first identify the specific affective event and then determine the type of emotive communication that is generated in response to that event.

For example, in her analysis of a corporate merger, Kiefer (2002) outlines and explicates the specific emotions (i.e., fear, joy, anger) that characterized employees' reactions and attitudes towards this type of change effort. Although previous research has focused on the spontaneous emotions surrounding change, future research needs to hone in on the more strategic, *emotive* messages that are crafted by organizations in building employees' solidarity for change. Results from this study indicated that implementers often felt compelled to engage in their own form of spin by communicating the change message in as positive light as possible. Issues that have yet to be addressed with respect to this process are (a) how managers initially interpret the change message for themselves and (b) how their communication of that message impacts employees' emotional responses to the change. Thus, in the case of organizational change, it would be useful for researchers to analyze how the emotive aspects of these messages are deconstructed and infiltrated into managers' conversations with team members and how such discourse then translates into specific change outcomes.

On that note, scholars are further encouraged to develop more emotional theories of organizational change that include both predictors and outcomes unique to the change process. Although the present study certainly represents a positive step in that direction, one limitation of this research is that it does not adequately identify change specific variables that might further influence the emotional labor performed by change implementers. For example, the amount of time that managers spend implementing change, the history of the work group that has been charged with specific implementation duties, as well as the organization's previous success with change, are all factors that underscore the degree of emotional investment that managers make to the change

process. As such, these factors might also be useful in explaining and predicting the type of emotive effort leaders put forth in directing others through a planned initiative.

However, as previously indicated, scholars should also look beyond different predictors relevant to change and explore the relationship between the performance of emotional labor and specific change outcomes. If emotion labor research is to be acknowledged and utilized by leaders on the front lines of change, then scholars need to do more to empirically determine if, and to what extent, the managed communication of emotions is tied to the perceived success, or failure, of organizational change.

For example, in their study of service providers, Kruml and Geddes (2000a) discovered that how individuals managed their emotional labor (i.e., surface acting, deep acting) influenced the type of consequences that ensued. They determined that the emotive effort put forth to deep act was positively associated with job involvement, while surface acting was found to be negatively related to individuals' sense of personal accomplishment and satisfaction with the job.

Extending these findings to organizational change, it would be useful to determine how acting types influence a number of specific change outcomes, including members' motivation and commitment to change, their overall satisfaction with the change effort, as well as their perceived success of the change. Scholars should also assess how and to what extent implementers' performance of emotional labor plays a role in their achievement of specific change objectives. Perhaps if the relationship between the performance of emotional labor and change outcomes was more clearly defined, organizations would be more inclined to provide greater training and resources for

implementers looking to overcome the challenge of having to balance both spontaneous and strategic emotions.

Moreover, in developing emotion-based theories of change, it will be necessary to pursue research that reframes change as an emotive process. The turning points described by several of the interview participants in this study help support the notion that change management is a process largely characterized and shaped by the emotions of others.

Although it would certainly be convenient for managers, as leaders, to establish and consistently rely upon a set of emotive norms for guiding members through the change process, norms can shift based on the climate, circumstances, and emotions of their fellow coworkers. Therefore, we need more longitudinal studies that will illuminate these different points and the myriad emotions that accompany them. In pursuing this particular line of research, however, scholars will want to avoid asking questions that may only emphasize the negative emotions characterizing the change process. Rather, research would greatly benefit from studies that purposely examine how communication serves to genuinely excite, motivate and invigorate employees during the change process.

Finally, in addition to the calls made for examining emotional labor across a variety of industries and professions, more research needs to explore emotional labor at it occurs within, rather than at, the boundaries of the organization. Although the findings here are somewhat inconclusive, what they do suggest is that emotional labor, as it is more traditionally defined, “looks” differently when it is performed between coworkers than it does when enacted with clients. If that is the case, then it would behoove scholars to examine such differences and develop theories as to why these differences exist. Research should first examine under what conditions or contexts does emotional labor

function differently. A second question to address is if emotional labor does function differently, then does it cease to be emotional labor? In other words, is autonomous emotional labor still emotional labor, or does it represent something else entirely? As researchers, we want to explore different contexts, industries and professions that will shed additional light on what emotional labor is and how it impacts the workplace. At the same time, however, we need to be careful that we do not overuse or over treat the notion of emotional labor to the point of muddying the conceptual waters even more.

Conclusion

The present study not only underscores the emotionality of planned organizational change but also reveals that emotional labor may function differently in superior-subordinate interactions than it does in more traditional client-service contexts. As such, it is necessary that we attempt to understand the experience of emotional labor across a variety of industries, professions and organizational contexts (Humphrey, 2000; Pugliesi & Shook, 1997; Waldron, 1994). Organizational change offers a very practical and meaningful context in which to study emotion management because of the number of emotional agendas attended to by change implementers. Developing an integrated model of emotions and organizational change will not only help to extend the theoretical landscape of emotional labor but, pragmatically, it may serve to highlight the potential negative, as well as positive, influence that emotional labor, and emotion work in general, can have on change implementers.

Appendix A
Interview Protocol/Questions

- I. Preparation for the Role*
 - A. How did you prepare for leading others through change?
 - B. How did you know the appropriate emotions to convey?
 - 1. Describe any training you received.
 - 2. What would have prepared you more, if anything, for this particular role?

- II. Communicating the Change*
 - A. How did you typically talk about the issues surrounding the change with your employees? (example: what medium did you employ most?)
 - 1. Why did you use this particular medium?
 - 2. What features were most useful?
 - 3. How effective was this particular medium?
 - B. What did you say to employees to get them on board with the change?
 - 1. How do you feel your staff responded to your attempts to “sell” the change, so to speak?
 - 2. If you ever did feel like you were putting on a front, how effective do you think you were in convincing others to get on board with the change?
 - a. What did you do to mask any genuine emotions you may have been feeling?
 - 3. Looking back on that, how did you feel after you had those conversations or meetings with your staff?
 - 4. Compare this to other managers in your position and how they communicate change.
 - C. How do/did you deal with resistance from others?
 - 1. What do you say to an employee who may resistant to the change?
 - 2. How do you deal with any dissonant feelings you have about the change?

- III. Perspectives on Change*
 - A. How would you describe the culture of your organization during this particular change effort?
 - 1. Give me an example that reflects this perspective. Why do you feel this way?
 - 2. Why do you feel the organization promoted this change?
 - B. If you could all over again, what might you do differently?

IV. Relationship with others

A. Describe your managerial style.

1. What is your relationship with your staff/team like?
2. How would your staff describe you as a leader during this change effort?

B. How would you describe your relationship with your colleagues—those also responsible for implementing change? Superiors?

1. Describe the interactions you would have with other change implementers about the change.
2. What did others say to you when you went to them for support?
3. What did you say to others when they came to you for support?

Appendix B

Retained Items of Relevant Measures

Independent Variables

Role Identity

- My role as a manager is not my first priority-RC
 - I often describe myself to others by saying “I am a manager with” or “I am a supervisor for.....”
 - Most of my time is invested in my role as a manager/supervisor
 - I do not get offended when others criticize management-RC
 - When someone praises the management of this organization, it feels like a personal compliment to me.
 - When others criticize my job, it feels like a personal insult.
 - I find it easy to identify with my job/occupation.
 - Being a manager/supervisor is a large part of who I am as a person.
-

Self-monitoring

- When I feel that the image I am portraying isn't working, I can readily change it to something that does.
 - I have found that I can adjust my behavior to meet the requirements of any situation in which I find myself.
 - Once I know what the situation calls for, it's easy for me to regulate my actions accordingly.
- I tend to change my behavior depending on the situation or person with whom I am interacting.
-

Empathy

Empathic Concern

- I am concerned about the feelings of people I manage
- When I perceive that members of my team are being taken advantage of, I tend to feel protective of them.
- I am concerned if members of my team/staff are depressed.
- I am touched by the things that I see happen to the people I supervise.

Emotional contagion

- I find that I can remain calm in spite of the excitement around me-RC
 - I tend to remain calm even though my team may worry-RC
 - I become nervous if those I supervise are nervous about work-related issues.
 - I do not get upset when one of my team/staff members is upset-RC
 - The people I manage have a great influence on my moods
-

Certainty of Emotive Norms

- My boss is clear about what emotions I need to convey in order to get my team “on board” with this particular change.
 - I have been told what I need to know about how to be a positive agent for change within this organization.
-

Congruency of Expressed Emotions

- When implementing this change, my fellow managers/supervisors and I encourage our employees in much the same way.
 - The behaviors I exhibit when trying to motivate my employees about this change are usually not the same as other managers/supervisors.-RC
 - The feelings that I express to my employees when implementing this change are typically the same as other managers/supervisors.
-

Routineness of Change

- Daily operations within this company are fairly stable and predictable.-RC
 - It seems like things never stay the same around here.
 - I never know what to expect from one day to the next at this organization.
 - Procedures and policies are constantly in flux at this organization.
 - The organization frequently changes the way it does things.
-

Self-Efficacy

- To what extent are you confident in your ability to sell the change successfully?
 - To what extent are you confident in your ability to convince others that the change is a positive one?
 - To what extent are you confident in your ability to adequately address others’ questions about the change?
 - To what extent are you confident in your ability to overcome objections that others have about the change?
 - To what extent are you confident in your ability to relieve the anxiety people have about the change?
 - To what extent are you confident in your ability to effectively communicate the change message?
 - To what extent are you confident in your ability to effectively deal with people’s resistance to the change?
 - To what extent are you confident in your ability to motivate others to embrace the change?
-

Perceived Consequences of Change

- Success or failure of this change will have significant impact on the long-term viability of this organization.
- Success or failure of this change will significantly impact the financial position of this organization.
- Success or failure of this change will significantly impact my financial earnings.
- Success or failure of this change will greatly impact the organization's overall market value.
- Successful implementation of this change affects my promotability in the organization.

Dependent Variables

Emotional Labor

Deep Acting

- When implementing this change, I attempt to create certain emotions within myself that are consistent with what the organization desires.
- When trying to implement this change, if I pretend to be positive about it, then I can actually start to feel positive.
- When implementing this change, my employees believe that the emotions I convey are sincere, even if sometimes I know they are not.
- When implementing this change, I try to change my actual feelings to match those that I know I need to express to my employees.
- I can alter my own feelings about the change when interacting with my employees.
- If I think the organization would not approve of my real feelings about the change, I try to alter those feelings.

Surface Acting

- When implementing this change, the emotions that I show to those I manage match what I truly feel.-RC
- The feelings that I express as part of the change effort are the same as those I genuinely feel inside.-RC
- I have to cover up my true feelings when managing others through this change effort.

-When it comes to implementing this change, I don't express the same feelings to my employees that I feel inside.

-I try to talk myself out of feeling what I really feel when managing others during this change.-RC

-In terms of this change effort, I talk myself into expressing emotions that are different from what I genuinely feel.

-I typically fake the emotions I show when implementing this change.

-When implementing this change, I tend to hold back my true feelings and emotions in order to meet the expectations of the organization.

References

- Abraham, R. (1998). Emotional dissonance in organizations: Antecedents, consequences and moderators. *Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs*, 124, 229-247.
- Abraham, R. (1999). The impact of emotional dissonance on organizational commitment and intention to turnover. *The Journal of Psychology*, 133, 441-455.
- Abraham, R. (2000). The role of job control as a moderator of emotional dissonance and emotional intelligence. *The Journal of Psychology*, 134, 169-184.
- Adelmann, P. K. (1989). *Emotional labor and well-being*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Psychology, The University of Michigan.
- Adelmann, P. K. (1995). Emotion labor as a potential source of job stress. In S. Sauter & R. Murphy (Eds.), *Organizational risk factors for job stress* (pp. 371-381). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Arbuckle, J. L. (2003). *Amos 5.0 update to the Amos User's Guide*. Chicago, IL: Smallwaters Corporation.
- Ashforth, B. E. (2001). *Role transitions in organizational life: An identity-based perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R. H. (1993). Emotional labor in service roles: The influence of identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 88-115.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R. H. (1995). Emotion in the workplace: A reappraisal. *Human Relations*, 48(2), 97-125.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 20-39.

- Ashforth, B. E., & Tomiuk, M. A. (2000). Emotional labor and authenticity: Views from service agents. In S. F. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotion in organizations* (pp. 101-114). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ashkanasy, N. M., & Daus, C. S. (2002). Emotion in the workplace: The new challenge for managers. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16(1), 76-86.
- Ashkanasy, N. M., & Tse, B. (2000). Transformational leadership as management of emotion: A conceptual review. In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. E. J. Hartel, & W. J. Zerbe (Eds.), *Emotions in the workplace* (pp. 221-235). Westport, CT: Quorum.
- Averill, J. (1982). *Anger and aggression: An essay on emotion*. New York: Springer.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Barrera, M. (1981). Social support in the adjustment of pregnant adolescents: Assessment issues. In B. H. Gottlieb (Ed.), *Social networks and social support* (pp. 69-96). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Barrett, F. J., Thomas, G. F., & Hocevar, S. P. (1995). The central role of discourse in large-scale change: A social constructionist perspective. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 31, 353-372.
- Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bartunek, J. M. (1984). Changing interpretive schemes and organizational restructuring: The example of a religious order. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29, 355-372.

- Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indices in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 238-246.
- Buck, R. (1984). *The communication of emotion*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Bunker, K. A., Kram, K. E., & Ting, S. (2002). The young and the clueless. *Harvard Business Review*, 80(12), 80-87.
- Byrne, B. M. (2001). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS: Basic concepts, application and programming*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Callahan, J. L., & McCollum, E. E. (2002). Obscured variability: The distinction between emotion work and emotional labor. In N. M. Ashkanasy, W. J. Zerbe, & C. E. J. Hartel (Eds.), *Managing emotions in the workplace* (pp. 219-231). Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Cheney, G. (1982). *Identification as a process and product: A field study*. Unpublished master's thesis, Purdue University.
- Cohen, S., & Hoberman, H. (1983). Positive events and social supports as buffers of life change stress. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 13, 99-125.
- Conrad, C., & Witte, K. (1994). Is emotional expression repression oppression? Myths of organizational affective regulation. In S. Deetz (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook*, 17 (pp. 417-428). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Davies, M. D., Stankov, L., & Roberts, R. D. (1998). Emotional intelligence: In search of an elusive construct. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 989-1015.

- DePaulo, B. M. (1982). Social-psychological processes in informal help seeking. In T. A. Willis (Ed.), *Basic processes in helping relationships* (pp. 255-279). New York: Academic Press.
- DeSanctis, G., & Poole, M. S. (1994). Capturing complexity with advanced technology use: Adaptive structuration theory. *Organization Science*, 5, 121-147.
- Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and Internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Duck, J. (2001). *The change monster*. New York, NY: Crown Business.
- Erickson, R. J., & Ritter, C. (2001). Emotional labor, burnout and inauthenticity: Does gender matter. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 64, 146-163.
- Fairhurst, G. T. (1993). Echoes of the vision: When the rest of the organization talks Total Quality. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 6, 331-371.
- Fairhurst, G. T., Cooren, F., & Cahill, D. J. (2002). Discursiveness, contradictions, and unintended consequences in successive downsizings. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 15, 501-540.
- Fairhurst, G. T., Green, S., & Courtright, J. (1995). Inertial forces and the implementation of a socio-technical systems approach: A communication study. *Organization Science*, 6, 168-185.
- Fairhurst, G. T., Jordan, J. M., & Neuwirth, K. (1997). Why are we here? Managing the meaning of the organizational mission statement. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 25, 243-263.
- Field, A. (2003). *Discovering statistics: Using SPSS for Windows*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Fineman, S. F. (1993). Organizations as emotional arenas. In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotion in organizations* (pp. 36-57). London: Sage.
- Fineman, S. F. (1999). Emotion and organizing. In S. Clegg, C. Hardy, and W. Nord (Eds.), *Studying organizations*. London: Sage.
- Fineman, S. F. (2000). Commodifying the emotional intelligent. In S. F. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotion in organizations* (pp. 101-114). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Frost, P. (2003). *Toxic emotions at work: How compassionate managers handle pain and conflict*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Fulk, J. (1993). Social construction of communication technology. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 921-950.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Goldsmith, D. J., & Fitch, K. (1997). The normative context of advice as social support. *Human Communication Research*, 23, 454-476.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam.
- Hall, G. E., Hord, S. M. (2001). *Implementing Change: Patterns, Principles & Pot Holes*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hewlin, P. F. (2003). And the award for the best actor goes.....: Facades of conformity in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 28, 633-642.
- Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Humphrey, R. H. (2000). The importance of job characteristics to emotional displays. In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. E. J. Hartel, & W. J. Zerbe (Eds.), *Emotions in the workplace* (pp. 234-249). Westport, CT: Quorum.
- Huy, Q. N. (2001). In praise of middle managers. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(8), 72-79.
- Huy, Q. N. (2002). Emotional balancing of organizational continuity and radical change: The contribution of middle managers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47, 31-69.
- Jordan, P. J., Ashkanasy, N. M., Hartel, C. E. J. (2002). Emotional intelligence as a moderator of emotional and behavioral reactions to job insecurity. *Academy of Management Review*, 27, 361-372.
- Kahn, R. L. (1981). *Work and health*. New York: Wiley.
- Kahn, R., Wolfe, D., Quinn, R., Snoek, J., & Rosenthal, R. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: Wiley.
- Kanter, R. M. (2000). The enduring skills of change leaders. *Ivey Business Journal*, 64(5), 31-37.
- Karabanow, J. (1999). When caring is not enough: Emotional labor and you shelter workers. *Social Service Review*, 73, 340-365.
- Kiefer, T. (2002). Analyzing emotions for a better understanding of organizational change: Fear, joy, and anger during a merger. In N. M. Ashkanasy, W. J. Zerbe, & C. E. J. Hartel (Eds.), *Managing emotions in the workplace* (pp. 45-69). Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

- Kramer, M. W., & Hess, J. A. (2002). Communication rules for the display of emotions in organizational settings. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 16, 66-80.
- Kruml, S. M., & Geddes, D. (2000a). Catching fire without burning out: Is there an ideal way to perform emotional labor? In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. E. J. Hartel, & W. J. Zerbe (Eds.), *Emotions in the workplace* (pp. 177-188). Westport, CT: Quorum.
- Kruml, S. M., & Geddes, D. (2000b). Exploring the dimensions of emotional labor. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 14, 8-49.
- Lennox, R. D., & Wolfe, R. N. (1984). Revision of the self-monitoring scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 1349-1364.
- Leonard-Barton, D., & Sinha, D. K. (1993). Developer-user interaction and user satisfaction in internal technology transfer. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 1125-1139.
- Lewis, L. K. (1999). Disseminating information and soliciting input during planned organizational change: Implementers' targets, sources and channels for communicating. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 13, 43-75.
- Lewis, L. K. (2000). "Blindsided by that one" and "I saw that one coming": The relative anticipation and occurrence of communication problems and other problems in implementers' hindsight. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 28, 44-67.
- Lewis, L. K., Hamel, S. A., & Richardson, B. K. (2001). Communicating change to nonprofit stakeholders: Models and predictors of implementers' choices. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 15, 5-41.

- Lewis, L. K., Richardson, B. K., & Hamel, S. A. (2003). When the stakes are communicative: The lamb's and the lion's share during nonprofit planned change. *Human Communication Research*, 29, 400-430.
- Lewis, L. K., Schmisser, A. M., Stephens, K. K., & Weir, K. E. (2003). Advice to practitioners: A review of the popular press literature on planned change communication. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association*, San Diego, CA.
- Lewis, L. K., & Seibold, D. R. (1998). Reconceptualizing organizational change implementation as a communication problem: A review of literature and research agenda. In M. Roloff (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 21*, (pp. 93-151). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1350). Chicago: Rand McNally
- McLeod, J. M. & Chaffee, S. H. (1973). Interpersonal approaches to communication research. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 16, 469-500.
- Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 103-123.
- Mann, S. (1997). Emotional labour in organizations. *Leadership and Organizational Development*, 18(4), 4-13.
- Maslach, C. (1982). *Burnout: The cost of caring*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Middleton, D. R. (1989). Emotional style: The cultural ordering of emotions. *Ethos*, 17, 187-201.
- Miller, K. (2001). Quantitative research methods. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.). *New handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 137-160). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miller, K. (2002). The experience of emotion in the workplace: Professing in the midst of tragedy. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 15, 571-600.
- Miller, K., Birkholt, M., Scott, C. R., & Stage, C. (1995). Empathy and burnout in human services work: An extension of a communication model. *Communication Research*, 22, 123-147.
- Miller, K. I., Stiff, J. B., & Ellis, B. H. (1988). Communication and empathy as precursors to burnout among human service workers. *Communication Monographs*, 55, 250-265.
- Morgan, J. M., & Krone, K. J. (2001). Bending the rules of "professional" display: Emotional improvisation in caregiver performances. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 29, 317-340.
- Morris, J. A., & Feldman, D. C. (1996). The dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of emotional labor. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 986-1010.
- Morris, J. A., & Feldman, D. C. (1997). Managing emotions in the workplace. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 9, 257-275.
- Patchen, M. (1970). *Participation, achievement, and involvement on the job*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Planalp, S. (1999). *Communication emotion: Social, moral, and cultural processes*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Politzer, P. E. (1980). Network analysis and the logic of social support. In R. H. Price & P. E. Politser (Eds.), *Evaluation and action in the social environment*. New York: Academic Press.
- Poole, M. S., & DeSanctis, G. (1990). Understanding the use of group decision support systems. In C. Steinfield & J. Fulk, (Eds.), *Organizations and communication technology* (pp. 175-195). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Pugliesi, K., & Shook, S. L. (1997). Gender, jobs and emotional labor in a complex organization. *Social Perspectives on Emotion*, 4, 283-316.
- Putnam, L. L., & Mumby, D. K. (1993). Organizations, emotion and the myth of rationality. In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotion in organizations* (pp. 36-57). London: Sage.
- Rafaeli, A., & Sutton, R. I. (1987). Expression of emotion as part of the work role. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 23-37.
- Rafaeli, A., & Sutton, R. L. (1989). The expression of emotion in organizational life. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, 11, 1-42. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Rice, R. E., & Aydin, C. (1991). Attitudes towards new organizational technology. Network proximity as a mechanism for social information processing. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 219-244.

- Rutter, D. R., & Fielding, P. J. (1988). Sources of occupational stress: An examination of British prison officers. *Work & Stress*, 2, 291-299.
- Salovey, P., Meyer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9, 185-211.
- Schuler, S., & Sypher, B. D. (2000). Seeking emotional labor: When managing the heart enhances the work experience. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 14, 50-89.
- Sieber, J. E. (1992). *Planning ethically responsible research: A guide for students and internal review boards*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Silver, R., & Wortman, C. (1980). Coping with undesirable life events. In J. Garber & M. Seligman (Eds.), *Human helplessness: Theory and applications* (pp. 279-340). New York: Academic Press.
- Smith, A. C. III, & Kleinman, S. (1989). Managing emotions in medical school: Students' contacts with the living and the dead. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 52, 56-69.
- Spector, P. E. (1987). Method variance as an artifact in self-reported affect and perceptions at work: Myth or significant problem? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 438-443.
- Strauss, A. L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Strazdins, L. (2002). Emotional work and emotional contagion. In N. M. Ashkanasy, W. J. Zerbe, & C. E. J. Hartel (Eds.), *Managing emotions in the workplace* (pp. 232-250). Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Sutton, R. I., & Rafaeli, A. (1988). Untangling the relationship between displayed emotion and organizational sales: The case of convenience stores. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31, 461-487.
- Thoits, P. A. (1985). Self-labeling processes in mental illness: The role of emotional deviance. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91, 221-249.
- Timmers, M., Fischer, A. H., & Manstead, S. R. (1998). Gender differences in motives for regulating emotions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 974-985.
- Tolich, M. B. (1993). Alienating and liberating emotions at work. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 22, 361-381.
- Tracy, S. J. (2000). Becoming a character for commerce: Emotion Labor, self-subordination, and discursive construction of identity in a total institution. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 14, 90-128.
- Tracy, S. J., & Tracy, K. (2000). Emotion labor at 911: A case study and theoretical critique. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 26, 390-411.
- Turnbull, S. (1999). Emotional labour in corporate change programmes: The effects of organizational feeling rules on middle managers. *Human Resource Development International*, 2, 125-146.

- Turnbull, S. (2002). The planned and unintended emotions generated by a corporate change program. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 4(1), 22-38.
- Van Maanen, J., & Kunda, G. (1989). "Real feelings": Emotional expression and organizational culture. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, 6, 287-365. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Waldron, V. R. (1994). Once more with feeling: Reconsidering the role of emotion in work. In S. Deetz (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook*, 17 (pp. 388-416). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Waldron, V. R., & Krone, K. J. (1991). The experience and expression of emotion in the workplace: A study of a corrections organization. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 4, 287-309.
- Wallbott, H. G., & Scherer, K. R. (1989). Assessing emotion by questionnaire. In R. Plutchik & H. Kellerman (Eds.), *Emotion: Theory, research, and experience*, 4, 55-82. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. In R. I. Sutton and B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, 18, 1-74. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Wharton, A. S. (1993). The affective consequences of service work: Managing emotions on the job. *Work and Occupations*, 20, 205-232.
- Wharton, A. S. (1999). The psychosocial consequences of emotional labor. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 561, 158-176.

- Willis, T. A. (1983). Social comparison in coping and help-seeking. In B.M. DePaulo, A. Nadler, & J. D. Fisher (Eds.), *New directions in helping: Vol. 2. Help-seeking* (pp. 109-141). New York: Academic Press.
- Wright, D. B. (1997). *Understanding statistics: An introduction for the social sciences*. London: Sage.
- Wright, T. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). Emotional exhaustion as a predictor of job performance and voluntary turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 486-493.
- Zajonc, R. B. (1985). Emotion and facial efference: An ignored theory reclaimed. *Science*, April 5, 15-21.
- Zerbe, W. J. (2000). Emotional dissonance and employee well-being. In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. E. J. Hartel, & W. J. Zerbe (Eds.), *Emotions in the workplace* (pp. 189-214). Westport, CT: Quorum.
- Zorn, T. E. (2002). The emotionality of information and communication technology implementation. *Journal of Communication Management*, 7, 160-171.
- Zorn, T. E., Christensen, L. T., & Cheney, G. (1999). *Do we really want constant change?* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Zorn, T. E., Page, D. J., & Cheney, G. (2000). Nuts about change: Multiple perspectives on change-oriented communication in a public sector organization. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 13, 515-566.

VITA

Amy M. Schmisser was born in Kokomo, Indiana on August 17, 1973, the daughter of Jerry and Reggie Mattingly. After completing her high school education at Center Grove High School, Greenwood, Indiana, in 1991, she pursued a degree in Communication at Ohio University in Athens, Ohio. She received her Bachelor of Science degree in June 1995. Upon graduation, she worked as a sales manager for Rich's*Lazarus*Goldsmith's and, in September 1997, returned to school to pursue her Master's Degree at the University of Cincinnati. She received her M.A. in August 1999 before being awarded her Ph.D. from the University of Texas at Austin in May 2005. She is currently an assistant professor in the Department of Communication Studies at The University of Kansas in Lawrence, Kansas.

Permanent Address: 1108 Stonecreek Dr., Lawrence, Kansas 66049

This dissertation was typed by the author.